UNIV. OF
TORONTO
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/edinburghreviewo219londuoft

P
LE
E

The Edinburgh Review

or Critical Journal

JANUARY, 1914 —————— APRIL, 1914

To be continued Quarterly

Edited by HAROLD COX

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR
Publius Syrus

VOL. 219

134 283
1/10/14

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO
London, Bombay, and Calcutta
LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION COMPANY, New York
1914

CONTENTS OF VOL. 219.

No. 447 JANUARY, 1914

		PAGE
The Indian Moslem Outlook	H.H. THE AGA KHAN	1
The Solvency of Woman	MARTIN CHALONER	14
Henri Beyle	LYTTON STRACHEY	35
The Evolution of Contemporary French Literature	DR. GEORGES CHATTERTON-HILL	53
Houston Stewart Chamberlain	LORD REDESDALE	79
Utopian Toleration	REV. DR. MURRAY	91
A Year's Opera	LAWRENCE HAWARD	107
The Renaissance of Dancing	FELIX CLAY	123
Current Literature	WALTER DE LA MARE	142
The Honey-Bee	DR. A. E. SHIPLEY, F.R.S.	157
The Production of Power	G. H. BAILLIE	173
The Compulsory Settlement of Industrial Disputes	W. G. CONSTABLE	195
The New Monroism	W. ALISON PHILLIPS	212
The Coming Land Tyranny	THE EDITOR	237

No. 448 APRIL, 1914

The Issue of Kikuyu	THE DEAN OF DURHAM	257
The Position and Prospects of British Agriculture	. . . . .	284
The Oxford Dictionary	PROFESSOR J. HOOPS	307
A French Satirist in England	EDMUND GOSSE, C.B.	327
Irish Viceroys before the Union	HENRY C. SHELLEY	347
The Prose and Poetry of Giosue Carducci	ORLO WILLIAMS	368
Magic or Religion?	DR. R. R. MARETT	389
Current Literature	WALTER DE LA MARE	409
The Crown Colonies and Protectorates	SIR CHARLES BRUCE	427
The Navy and the Future	. . . . .	448
The Significance of Kingship	. . . . .	469
The Struggle for Freedom	THE EDITOR	481

The Edinburgh Review

JANUARY, 1914 No. 447

THE INDIAN MOSLEM OUTLOOK

1. **The Preaching of Islam.** By Professor T. W. ARNOLD, C.I.E. Revised and enlarged edition. Constable. 1913.
2. **Moral and Material Progress of India. Report for 1911–2.** H. o. C. 220. 1913.
3. **'The Times' articles on Indian Mussulmans.** April 19, October 7 and 31, November 8, 1913, and other dates.

DURING the present winter special attention has been directed to Indian Moslem affairs by an acute crisis in the London Branch of the All-India Moslem League, the organisation which represents the political views of the community.

For more than two years past the Moslems of India, in common with their co-religionists in other countries, have been going through most painful experiences. The Turkish loss of sovereignty in Northern Africa and in the Balkans, the continued disintegration of Persia, the treatment of Indians in South Africa, and certain matters of Indian administration, have all deeply affected Indian Moslems. The resulting restlessness among them has led to much searching of heart among their best friends, while in some quarters exaggerated ideas have been entertained as to the effect of these events upon the hearty loyalty hitherto shown by the community to the British Crown.

All rights reserved.

Lurid caricatures of the Moslem attitude, such as that drawn in ' The Times ' of October 7 last by ' A Correspondent ' in India,' are to be deplored, since they tend to suspicion and estrangement on both sides. It might well be the duty of a writer anxious to awaken the British public from a fool's paradise to be strident in tone, if his note of alarm was based upon full knowledge and free from prejudice. But this correspondent puts himself out of court as a competent and fair-minded witness in the very first sentence of his communication. He says :

' It is probable that the Balkan war would not have greatly influenced the bulk of Indian Mahommedans had it not been for the efforts of the Pan-Islamic agitators and their organs in the Press.'

He does not produce, and I believe he cannot produce, a single quotation to show that there has been a Pan-Islamic agitation in the political sense which his words, taken in connexion with the general tone of his article, seem intended to convey. If he means only that the Moslem Press of India has made the troubles of Turkey a subject of constant lamentation and has strongly criticised the policy of the Concert of Europe in general and of Great Britain in particular in that connexion, I accept the statement, though I take grave exception to the deduction drawn and to the prejudicial form in which it is conveyed. This correspondent might just as reasonably argue that Mr. Lloyd George's land campaign would attract no attention from the agricultural voter if the Liberal Press of England did not keep the question in view ; or that the problem of Ulster would be non-existent but for the newspaper notice it attracts. He mistakes cause for effect, and forgets that even a Press so new and crude as that of the Indian Moslems, like the Press of other countries, has to give its readers information on public matters in which they are most interested and must more or less reflect their attitude upon them.

The best answer to his suggestion that the Moslems would have felt no interest in the fate of Turkey if they had not been stirred up by agitators of doubtful loyalty is to be found in the clear-cut statement of the skilful publicist who is the Bombay correspondent of the same journal. Writing in ' The Times ' of the 19th of April 1913, when Moslem feeling

was at its height and had not been mollified by the Turkish re-conquest of Adrianople, he said :

' Let there be no misunderstanding of the real attitude of Indian Mahommedan opinion towards Turkey. There is much discussion in Europe of the position of the Sultan as Khalif. The Indian Moslem does not recognise the Sultan as Khalif, and offers him no allegiance in that capacity. But he does look upon Turkey as the embodiment of the temporal power of Islam, and he has no desire to see Islam reduced to the position of Israel, a religion without temporal status. This feeling affects all classes.' . . . ' An old Mahommedan friend of mine, a graduate of an English university, assured me that when the news of the battle of Lulu Burgas arrived he felt that the only course for him was to commit suicide.'

' A Correspondent in India ' contrasts the position now with that of 1897 and admits that there is insufficient ground for the view, then entertained in some quarters, that the great frontier rising was largely attributable to Moslem feeling on the Turco-Greek war. When, however, he goes on to say that internal India was hardly moved by that war, I deny his statement. Moslem India was not indifferent; far from it. It was the only topic of conversation or interest in Moslem society, and every mosque was illuminated throughout India, even in the small villages of the Deccan, to celebrate the success of the Turks. Nor does the ' Correspondent in India ' take into consideration the great and rapid changes which these sixteen years have brought, including the spread of education among Indian Moslems and the much fuller and more speedy dissemination of foreign news. Moreover, the Ottoman trouble in 1897 was limited to its relations with Greece, and no other Mahommedan State was involved ; whereas in the last two or three years the Moslem world has watched with grave misgiving and concern the supersession or control of Mussulman sovereignty by the intervention of Christian Powers in Morocco, in Tripoli, in the greater part of European Turkey, and in Persia. The cumulative effect of these continued losses of Moslem sovereignty on Indian Mahommedans has been reinforced by the spread of Western enlightenment among them.

It is idle for ' A Correspondent in India ' to lament the passing of the day when the Moslem community, in its apathy and ignorance, did not concern itself with international politics—if indeed that day ever existed. The Hindus have no sentimental interests outside India, apart from those

provided by the emigration of co-religionists to other portions of the Empire; their Mecca is Benares; their Holy Waters are those of the Ganges, not of the Euphrates or Tigris. In the days when they alone of the chief Indian communities interested themselves in public affairs it was natural that audible Indian opinion should be confined to the internal affairs of India and her relations with Great Britain. But the Mahommedans, newly awakened to national consciousness by the education England has given them, are not limited in their gaze by the vast ramparts of the Himalayas or by the waters of the Indian Ocean. There is between them and their fellow-believers in other lands an essential unity, which breaks through differences of sect and country, for it is not based on religious grounds alone. Carlyle somewhere says that all men of the English-speaking race are subjects of King Shakespeare, and in the same way all Mussulmans are subjects of the 'Arabian Nights.' They share the glorious heritage not only of the Koran (which they are taught in early childhood to read in the original Arabic) but of the history and philosophy of Arabia, the incomparable poetry of Persia, and the romances and legends of Egypt and Morocco and Spain. Drinking from these imperishable springs, Moslems, whether Turks, Persians, Arabs or Indians, and whether or not they have also come to the Western wells of knowledge, are bound together by a certain unity of thought, of sentiment, and of expression. The feeling of brotherhood thus engendered is not dammed up within the confines of devout faith. On the contrary, agnostics and atheists of Moslem origin have felt the Turkish and Persian misfortunes just as much as the most orthodox mullah. To ask why the Indian Mussulman, blest with a beneficent rule, should concern himself so much about international issues affecting co-religionists, is as futile as asking why men on the rack of torture cry out with physical pain. That the excitement has not been connected with the question of the Caliphate is shown by the fact that Shias have been moved by these emotions no less strongly than Sunnis. All sections of the Moslem world are moved by a deep sentiment, originally called into being by the Prophet's summons of all the faithful into one great brotherhood and welded through the centuries into a lasting bond by a common faith, a common literature, a common outlook, and a common history.

Discussing in the new edition of his erudite 'Preaching of 'Islam' the causes of the continued spread of the faith in the almost entire absence of systematic missionary organisation, Professor T. W. Arnold lays stress on the non-political Pan-Islamic movement rendered possible to a degree undreamt of by earlier generations by modern means of communication, and seeking to bind all nations of the Moslem world in a common bond of sympathy :

'This trend of thought gives a powerful stimulus to missionary labours ; the effort to realise in actual life the Moslem ideal of brotherhood of all believers reacts on collateral ideals of the faith, and the sense of a vast unity and of a common life running through the nations, inspirits the hearts of the faithful and makes them bold to speak in the presence of the unbelievers ; . . . The spiritual energy of Islam is not, as has been so often maintained, commensurate with its political power.'

During the currency of the Balkan war we were needlessly told that Great Britain could not allow her international policy to be dictated by the wishes of the King's Moslem subjects. For this no sane Mussulman asks. It is obvious that a great variety of factors have to be taken into account in the shaping of British foreign policy ; but surely one of these, which should be entitled to the fullest consideration, is the sentiment of a people, nearly 100 millions of whom are under the sovereignty or protection of King George. It should at least be held as a working thesis for the Foreign Office that when British interests generally coincide with Moslem wishes, the combination is advantageous. But when the Prime Minister publicly lectured the Porte for reoccupying Adrianople by force of arms and warned her to clear out, Indian Moslems asked in vain what British interests would be served by turning Turkey out of Adrianople and installing the Bulgarians against the wishes of the inhabitants. I have a firm conviction that if important British interests were disturbed by Turkish policy—if, for example, we can imagine the Ottoman Government threatening the independence of Holland or Belgium—the Indian Moslems would give no moral support to such a policy, and indeed would loyally uphold England in taking active measures for its frustration. But why should England have gone out of her way to support Bulgarian aggression in Thrace, contrary to the strong wishes of her Moslem subjects, and to local sentiment and interests ?

The events of the last two years have not shaken the conviction of Indian Moslems that Great Britain in her own interests should be the friend and supporter of the Ottoman power. It is all very well to say that the Young Turks have forfeited the hopes and good wishes entertained when they overthrew the Hamidian *régime*. It is not fair to judge the administrative capacity of a people unversed in the great art of constitutional government when they are engaged in a life-and-death struggle, brought upon them in the first instance by the unprovoked aggression of one of the Great Powers of Europe. Their dissensions, and at some critical moments their incompetence, have to be recognised; but they must be judged by their powers of statesmanship when there is some recovery from the exhaustion of the fighting and tumults of the last two years, and the great and difficult work of reconstruction has been entered upon. After all, their misdeeds bear no comparison with those of the sanguinary Commune ushering in the Third Republic of France, which has now stood unshaken the test of more than forty years' existence.

Indian Moslems strongly hold that in the reconstructive work before the Constantinople Government the moral support of Great Britain is called for in her own interests. The break-up of Turkey and the partition of her Asiatic provinces must be disadvantageous to Great Britain in any conceivable scheme of distribution. France would lay claim to Syria, Germany to Anatolia with Northern and Central Mesopotamia, and Russia to Kurdistan and Armenia. Great Britain would be left to take Arabia and Southern Mesopotamia, and would thus become possessed of another wild country without possibilities of great development and with a long and exposed frontier. Side by side with this cumbersome and barren increase of territorial responsibility, the British Empire would be brought into closer contact with the great continental Powers whose immense armies would be less dependent on the sea for their communications. The route to India, already removed from exclusively British keeping, would then be further exposed to attack by several other Powers. For these reasons a strong and stable Turkish Government in Asia ought to be a cardinal principle of British international policy. To Mahommedans it is reassuring to know that

the above considerations are duly recognised by the just and wise statesman who now rules India. Lord Hardinge won the grateful thanks of the community by the ready encouragement he gave to their practical sympathy with the Turkish troops and people by placing himself at the head of the Red Crescent movement, which was so splendidly responded to by all classes of Moslems. He has further consoled and gratified Mahommedans by the assurance he gave in the Imperial Legislative Council on the 17th of September last, that :

'The British Government, who fully realise the importance of the existence of Turkey as an independent Power, and, in view of the religious interests of the Mahommedans of India, the necessity for the maintenance of the *status quo* as regards the Holy Places in Arabia, are still anxious and ready to help the Turkish Government to introduce reforms and good government, and to consolidate the position of Turkey. There is absolutely no reason why Turkey, while pursuing a steady policy of reforms, should not still be strong and powerful and the second greatest Mahommedan Power in the world.'

The Indian Moslems are also grateful to Lord Hardinge for the withdrawal of the regiment of the Central India Horse which was sent to Southern Persia some time ago, and for his recognition in the speech just quoted of the anxiety of the Moslem peoples that no step should be taken calculated to further weaken the sovereignty and independence of Iran. But they feel that Great Britain has been far too complaisant in respect to the arbitrary proceedings of Russia in the north. Mindful of the history of Muscovite absorption of the Central Asian Khanates, they fear that annexation, in fact if not expressly in name, will be the inevitable sequel of Russian policy. If Russia took the north, England would have to make another Afghanistan, much less easily defensible, out of the south. The Indian Moslems are also concerned to see Great Britain taking part with apparent readiness in the formulation of projects for a trans-Persian railway that can benefit only Russia. Great Britain continually claims to be the friend of Persia, and it may be hoped that she will exercise the duties and privileges of friendship by giving moral and financial support only to railways designed for Persia's commercial development instead of consenting to a strategical line through the unpeopled deserts of Yezd, Kerman, and Baluchistan. Any line designed to develop Persian or Anglo-

Indian commerce would run from the head waters of the Gulf to the centres of population in Persian Irak and join the Russian section at Ispahan. But a trans-continental line for the convenience of travellers to India, and avoiding all the potentially rich parts of Persia, will do little or nothing to regenerate that country or further develop Anglo-Indian trade. In this matter also British and Moslem interests converge. A railway through Eastern Persia into India would be a constant menace on the frontier, and British participation or acquiescence therein would be at variance with the traditional policy pursued with watchful vigilance and at heavy if necessary cost to India for a century past.

The Indian Moslem does not ask for the surrender of any British interests; he simply points out that these interests are in accord with Moslem sentiment and wishes. Yet his incursion into international politics is frowned upon in reactionary Anglo-Indian quarters as if it were in some mysterious and inexplicable way disloyal. People who make these charges might reflect that the Mussulmans of India gain absolutely nothing for themselves, in any material or political sense, from the preservation of the Moslem States; they are simply animated by the sentiments of unity and brotherhood above referred to, which are stronger than these unsympathetic and unimaginative critics can realise.

But with the Turkish reoccupation and retention of Adrianople the tension has been relaxed and the Indian Moslems are once more turning their thoughts to internal affairs. The critics have been perturbed by the appearance on the scene of a new type of Moslem, who, apart from Islamic religion and sentiment, has gone through exactly the same education and training as young Hindus of the same social class. This type did not formerly exist, for in the old days the Hindu and the Mussulman of the same social class were brought up on an entirely different educational basis. The young Mussulman had to make it his chief concern to be well cultured in Persian and Arabic. There were thus few points of contact between Mahommedan and Hindu, and, in the stage of political development India had reached, much less ground for and possibility of unity of effort than now. Take any typical young Mahommedan of the upper middle classes to-day, and it will be found that, apart from the traditional religion of his family inculcated by his mother, his

education has been entirely on the lines of a Hindu of the same class. Even in the case of a student from a Moslem institution like the Aligarh College, the course of studies, the training of the teachers and their outlook, and the probable profession of the student in the future, are the same as in a Government or a Hindu college.

These considerations are even more applicable to the increasing throng of Moslems coming to England and joining Hindu fellow-countrymen at the Universities, the Inns of Court, and the Technical Schools. This potent change, which has attracted much less attention than it has deserved, is not much if any older than the still youthful twentieth century, and it has only begun to make itself felt effectively in actual political life within the last two or three years. The men brought up under the new system are coming to the front, and have influenced the increasing approximation of political views and sentiments among educated men of the different communities. This unity is a measure of the growth of Indian nationhood, and it is the part of wise statesmanship, British and Indian, in the domain of internal affairs, to seek, not so much to satisfy the Mussulmans as Mussulmans or the Hindus as Hindus, as to win the hearty co-operation of all moderate, loyal, and reasonable opinion wherever it exists. It is the only policy that will succeed, in Lord Morley's phrase, in 'rallying the Moderates,' and thus forming the most effective instrument in the discomfiture and impotence of the small but active element in Indian life which, as Lord Sydenham has said, must be reckoned as permanently hostile to British rule. While at the one extreme there is a handful of revolutionaries, at the other there is a worthy, substantial but decreasing class of men of the old school who think it right to accept whatever the Government, or even the officials, may decree without exercising any critical faculty thereon. But between these two there is a vast mass of Indian opinion passing through a transition stage, alert, sometimes fault-finding, perhaps suspicious, perhaps not very clearly knowing what it wants, and greatly perplexed and disheartened by such questions as the treatment of Indians in South Africa, greatly anxious and worried about the future of Indians in East Africa and in the island of Zanzibar. With all his weaknesses, this type of man, if rightly handled, is essentially reasonable at bottom, loyal to the King, and fully aware that India's

welfare and happiness depend on the continuance of British rule.

The Moslem community may co-operate with the Hindus on a vast number of public questions, but they have their own special needs and outlook, not confined to the international issues to which I have referred. Both the educational and political condition of the Hindus is far in advance in time, and also in relative extent, of that of the Mahommedans; and it is not to be forgotten that the difference of religion between them goes to the roots of their social polity.

It has been the work of the All-India Moslem League to give the Mussulmans a political platform and to prevent their disappearance as a national entity on account of the indifference to political issues which formerly characterised them. The League came into existence only some seven or eight years ago, and so far from its work being done, it has reached a stage of evolution in which, if wise counsels prevail, it can do greater service than in the past. The crisis in the affairs of the London League, brought to a head by Mr. Ameer Ali's resignation,* confirms my conviction that the time has fully come for the Indian Mussulmans to realise that the future of the community depends not upon this or that particular leader but upon the people themselves. If there is any danger that excitable younger men may lead the League to an attitude of suspicious impatience, it is for the calmer and more reasonable section to bestir itself and to keep the organisation in its own hands, and meet the opposite party, not with abuse but with argument. The situation is one in which talents hitherto undiscovered may be drawn out for the good of the community in the country as a whole. I am confident that the great mass of educated Moslem opinion is sound and sober, and I believe that in India open discussion on the platform of the League, freed from the restraint of a permanent presidentship, will be the best means of bringing the weight of this opinion to bear on the questions of the day. But the situation of the London League is different, for there

* Since the above article was written, the moderate section of the All-India Moslem League has asserted itself, and in response to telegrams from important centres of the League in India Mr. Ameer Ali has consented to resume his presidency of the London League, and H.H. the Aga Khan has consented to become honorary president of that League.—EDITOR.

the community consists exclusively of two classes—elderly men of weight and standing on the one side, and inexperienced students on the other. It is obviously impossible for the latter to instruct and influence English opinion on Moslem affairs without guidance from the former. Hence, while I am most anxious to see a reconstruction of the London League I feel it is essential that this should be based upon co-operation with the residents, and I, for one, could never join or support an institution run by students only.

To the work of rallying the Moderates of Indian political life, whether Hindu or Mussulman, the British Government can materially contribute by the maintenance of the sympathetic and progressive policy pursued by Lord Hardinge. Statesmanship should aim at alleviating legitimate discontent, duly recognising the intense national sentiment and pride of educated India, and encouraging it to follow right channels. Articulate Indian opinion has to be allied more and more closely with British rule in a spirit of mutual respect and co-operation. One of the most potent forces in this direction is that of promoting the economic development of the country. We have the lamentable admission that considerable numbers of educated youths in Bengal terrorise remote villages by forming bands of dacoits for purposes of plunder, because they have no other means of livelihood. How this situation arises is shown in a suggestive statement in the decennial 'Moral and Material Progress and Condition' Report presented to Parliament a few months ago. The chapter on the condition of the people states (page 377) that in the Bengals :

'The economic development of the country has not kept pace with the educational progress of the people. An ever-growing number of youths are leaving the schools and the University, but fresh avenues of employment are few. Altogether 580,000 persons have a knowledge of English in the two provinces of Bengal and Behar and Orissa, the number having increased by over 200,000 since 1901 ; but a special census of industrial concerns employing twenty persons or more shows that the total number of Indians engaged in direction, supervision, and clerical work is only 20,000.'

Another requirement is to remove the unfortunate impression that Indian students are discouraged from coming to England, and that the facilities formerly open to them at Oxford and Cambridge are restricted for that purpose. Young

Indians do not make sufficient allowance for the practical difficulties which arise from the great increase in their numbers since the distant days when an Indian student was given special attention as an interesting novelty in the life of the University. No doubt the system of exotic preparation for professional or official life has grave drawbacks, but until India is much better equipped educationally than at present, ambitious youths will inevitably go abroad in increasing numbers to fit themselves for future success. This being so, nothing can be more foolish than to lead them to direct their gaze to Japan, to the United States, or to Germany, under the apprehension that they may be cold-shouldered in England. Any well-behaved Indian youth coming here should feel and know that he is welcome. Every encouragement should be given to him to mix freely with British contemporaries in study, and to see English life at its best. After all, the great work of the British people in India has been that of broadening and expanding Indian ideals, and it is clearly advantageous that Indians studying outside their own country should come here to absorb English ideas at first hand, rather than spend their most impressionable years elsewhere.

An even more serious matter is the treatment of Indians in South Africa, Canada, and other parts of the King's dominions. This is a source of constant irritation, and is a most powerful weapon in the hands of anti-British extremists. The renewal of passive resistance in South Africa, and the wholesale arrests of Indians for the quiet assertion of rights, taken from them contrary to pledges given, have been most unfortunate from the standpoint of Indian good-will. It is amazing that Colonial statesmen should continue a situation which is utterly inimical to the solidarity of the British Empire ; and to the average Indian it is a matter of pained astonishment and doubt that his Majesty's Government—the powerful arbiter of Imperial issues—appeals in vain for justice to be done. And still worse is the grave danger that Zanzibar and Pemba may be handed over to Germany, and that in East Africa a handful of white settlers may repeat some of the injustices that have already made of South Africa a running sore in the relations of England and India. The prosperity of Zanzibar has been made by its Indian merchants and traders, and we in India look upon the island as virtually though not geographically a part of India. Should this island be handed

over to Germany for some so-called advantage in the Persian Gulf, a region all Indians are most anxious to see remain in Turkish hands, the shock of this light-hearted way of dealing with an essentially Indian interest would be so great that I, for one, cannot foresee its consequences. Just as disastrous would be a repetition in East Africa generally of the conditions that now exist in South Africa. May the British people realise that the time has come for a decisive cry of 'Hands off!' from East Africa, to be addressed to the thoughtless people who wish to repeat the conditions of South Africa there!

Another matter upon which strong feeling prevails is that there should be fuller scope in local affairs for loyal but at the same time free criticism. The widening of the powers and functions of the Legislative Council has done much to give point and force to public sentiment on the larger issues, and this is necessarily reflected in the comments of a Press which, with all its great imperfections, is advancing in ability and is beginning to be really responsive to public needs. The days when not merely the considered will but even the capricious whim of the collector of a district was received without question and obeyed without hesitation have gone by, and in the sphere of every-day administration, no less than in the more conspicuous arena of the Legislatures, Supreme and Provincial, it is necessary for those in authority to give due weight to the general consensus of opinion. The district officer should at least know the direction in which public opinion tends, whether or not he can act upon it with due regard to the wider issues of which he has to take account. Through the varying stages of Indian evolution British rule has shown that power of adaptation which is essential to organic vigour. This has been strikingly exemplified in the marked success with which the Morley-Minto reforms have been woven into the administrative fabric. I look to the future with hope and confidence, because I am convinced that British statesmanship will continue to respond to the growth of national consciousness in India, and will thus bring an awakened people into still closer sympathy and co-operation with the aims and ideals of the enlightened rule that has revolutionised the conditions and the ideals of Indian life within living memory.

AGA KHAN.

THE SOLVENCY OF WOMAN

1. **The Unexpurgated Case against Woman Suffrage.** By Sir ALMROTH E. WRIGHT, M.D., F.R.S. Constable. 1913.
2. **The Vocation of Woman.** By Mrs. ARCHIBALD COLQUHOUN. Macmillan. 1913.
3. **Sex and Character.** By OTTO WEININGER. Translated from the sixth German edition. Heinemann. 1906.
4. **Man and Woman.** By HAVELOCK ELLIS. Fourth Edition. Walter Scott Publishing Company. 1904.
5. **Essay on Woman.** By SCHOPENHAUER.

MAN has many reasons to be dissatisfied with his species; but if those reasons be examined, they reduce themselves to one: virtues are rare, and faults are common. If there were no virtues there would be no adverse standard to provoke dissatisfaction. The splendour of the rare examples throws the shortcomings of the multitude into relief. That this is so we may see if we consider the low value that accrues to virtues which are common—common honesty, common kindliness, common industry. The general presence of these does not exalt our valuation of the race; we leave them out of account in framing our estimate. So also with woman. She gets no credit for her humdrum qualities; she is lashed for the rarity of virtues proper to her sex, for the want of virtues peculiar to man; dissatisfied with himself, man recovers his own approbation at the expense of woman.

Misanthropes of genius have scourged both man and woman impartially, but their theme is not attractive or popular; humanity does not love to be vilified; and the author who traduces humanity must feel some part of the invective recoiling upon himself, for he also is human. But the man who finds fault with women has a ready audience of men whose womankind does not come up to their expectations. Such disappointments must be frequent. Nature has thought fit to deceive us for her own ends; all men who are men have been at some time or times under the pleasing illusions of love; whatever virtues they may have found in the object

of their choice they were not those expected; they were not those presented as a lure by the magic of nature. Some men seek revenge for the innocent deception; and whether woman be judged by the defect of high virtues appropriate to her sex, or by the absence of virtues appropriate to males, her censor need not lack topics; moreover, the man who undertakes this ungracious task will suffer no loss of dignity in his own eyes or in those of many of his fellows: he and they will rejoice together that they are not as women are.

In the recesses of the female apartments a similar theme has no doubt been popular from time immemorial. All women have some kind of contempt for man, commonly good-natured, sometimes acrimonious; but their diatribes have been until recently declaimed in private. Many women must have been disappointed in their men, and might declare, after the pattern of Schopenhauer: 'I must have been insane 'to be attracted by such a broad-shouldered, flat-chested, 'square-limbed, narrow-hipped, coarse-featured, harsh-voiced, 'slow-witted creature as man.' Now that women speak in public, write for the public, write for women, it is natural that the abuse of men should be heard in the open. In developing this thesis women have the same advantage that Schopenhauer, Weininger, and Sir Almroth Wright enjoy: no part of the abuse can recoil upon their own sex. In discussing public affairs to the discredit of men they have a further advantage. Woman has managed the home, man has managed the State. The home resembles a workshop; workshops have always been better managed than the State. Public affairs, with the exception at rare intervals of military affairs, have never been managed well; it is perhaps impossible to manage them very well. Nor does it require any very acute critic to point out defects in the conduct of public business. We needlessly provide His Majesty's Opposition for the purpose, but their darts fall somewhat idle because we know that they would make similar blunders if they were in power. Woman can say, and does say, that if woman were in power her wisdom would rise superior to human imperfection. We may not believe it, we may deny it, but we have no experience wherewith to confute her assertions. She also has no experience; and having no experience she may actually believe that she speaks the truth.

It is often said that a man cannot understand a woman; it is less often said that a woman cannot understand a man. There is probably equal ground for both statements; but women, owing to their dependent position, have always taken pains to understand at least the outward manifestations of male nature. If men took as much pains to understand women as women do to understand men, they might perhaps achieve a better comprehension. There is no doubt a sex-barrier to complete understanding, for understanding depends upon similarity, and the similarity between men and women is incomplete. Sex-difference, as Weininger has said, is not concentrated in one or two organs or one or two functions; it runs all through. But the similarity also runs all through; and it is great enough to make a partial apprehension possible. The inconclusive reasoning by which Shylock proves that a Jew is the same as a Christian would prove that a woman is the same as a man. And, although a woman may not be so much like a man as a Jew is like a Christian, she is like enough to deserve more intelligent attention than she commonly receives from man. That is fortunate, for, whatever prejudice or custom may assert or demand, whatever even nature may suggest, we shall be forced in the future to treat our women more as men; the inexorable laws of bread and butter will force us to work with them and, therefore, at least superficially, to comprehend them. However much we may desire to blind our eyes, our unmarried women will require more attention at our hands; they are no longer a negligible part of the community.

That amazing youth Otto Weininger, who wrote his book, 'Sex and Character,' at the age of twenty-one, and died by his own hand two years later, is the prince of misogynists. He shows in his treatise of sham science a malevolence that is abnormal, a maturity that is monstrous, an insight that is often uncanny though always perverted. His pretensions are those of a philosopher, a man of the world, and an exact experimenter combined. He could not, in so short a span of life, however crowded with variety—and we must guess that his inward experience left him scant leisure for external adventure—learn all that he professes to know. The conclusions which he lays down with the conviction of Euclid cannot have been reached by demonstration, or

tradition, or experiment. Yet, for ruthless concentration on the wickedness inherited by the daughters of Eve, for consistent and logical elaboration of the prosecutor's case, for grim and plausible petition of all the principles, he leaves Schopenhauer far in the rear. However burning his need 'to give away the woman whom God gave to him,' Sir Almroth Wright could not have written such a book; he has too much respect for science. Now that the attacks of women have awakened the latent hostility of men, we may expect to see Weininger become the 'Paley's Evidences' of a certain class of men—a storehouse of reasons for the faith that is in them. 'Sex and Character' is already quoted as an authority —an authority, we presume, on what a perverted youth of twenty-one can guess. But, to do the author justice, he is logical to the finish. He concludes that since woman is such as he describes her, a good man would rather see the human race extinguished than have any relations with his feminine counterpart. 'Joyous maternity' is for Weininger too dearly purchased by the degradation of the man. This may be compared with the words of an eminent feminist: 'The higher the individual life rises in the scale of worth . . . 'the more easily does it lose interest in the duties of pro-'pagation.' It is a comfort to think that such men and such women will be sterile.

Yet there is wisdom in Weininger's madness. He asserts —he cannot prove, but we are prepared to believe him—that 'any individual . . . is never to be designated merely as a 'man or a woman, but by a formula showing that it is a com-'posite of male and female characters in different propor-'tions,' neither element being ever wholly absent. Thus many men have many female attributes, no man is wholly without them; many women have many male attributes, no woman is exclusively female. Yet we must be careful to distinguish the individual of whom this is true, from the average and from the type. In the professions, in commerce, in industry, the qualities of the individual chiefly matter. In these pursuits the woman who is nearly a man will be more at home than the woman who is excessively feminine. In politics, on the other hand, so far at least as the vote is concerned, the average will be important; the balance of women's votes would be cast in accordance with their preponderant—that

is, their feminine—characteristics. Weininger himself discusses neither the individual nor the average: he unveils the typical female, devoid of male attributes. This is correct from his point of view; though perhaps he was not so logical as he seemed when he preferred the extinction of the human race to matrimony. We do not marry the type, we wed the individual; we might be so fortunate as to find favour with a lady who was redeemed from femininity by being almost a man; in fact, she might be a woman only, as it were, by accident.

If we accept this proposition, that women are not wholly women, but only women more or less, we may view with less apprehension the future that lies clearly before us and will not be averted by any diatribes. The proposition cannot be proved, but it seems to be consonant with our common experience. If all women have something in them of the male, those who have a strong masculine blend may find a proper place in the occupations that are becoming more and more common to either sex. In all women, perhaps, the male elements can be developed by training, if that be desirable—or necessary.

But most of the opponents of the movement, which may for convenience be called feminist, assume that a woman is a woman and nothing but a woman; that her primary function is to bear children; that her secondary functions are summed up in the phrase to stay at home and mind the baby, with all that is implied thereby. But this profession of contented married woman—the happiest, it may be—is no longer open to all. Sir Almroth Wright himself points out that there are in England and Wales, of 8,000,000 women between the age of twenty and fifty, 3,000,000 unmarried. In Scotland the proportion is somewhat less, in Ireland even greater. It is useless to tell these women to get married and devote themselves to their womanly duties. Some of them no doubt may do so; others have not the requisite attractions or opportunities; some do not want to do so (the better for those who do); in any case, there are not enough men to go round, and of the men who are available many decline matrimony. Of the great multitude of whom no acceptable man has offered to take care, millions are earning their own livelihood. It is a futile mockery to tell these millions to go abroad

and get married in the Colonies; they cannot go, and if they could there is no corresponding force of unmarried and marriageable males over there. Mrs. Colquhoun, speaking of the middle classes, more plausibly hints at a similar solution; but she hesitates to bid women go abroad and hunt the male.

We cannot change the habits of the people. If the young men will not marry, or will not marry young, no power has yet been invented that can make them do so. By no known expedient can we remove the superfluity of women. We must therefore make up our minds to the fact that matrimony as a profession is no longer open to all women; there are many to whom it is not open; it is only the most important profession of women. We may estimate that one woman in three or four will have to earn her own bread. It is fortunate that the woman who is forced to find her own way in the world has in herself something of the male upon which she can call; from the indifferent, external male she has no reason to expect consideration or protection. If a man undertakes to protect a woman, from what or whom does he protect her? From starvation no doubt, and the angry elements; but that she might do for herself; his most useful protection is from other men, if she be young and attractive. Some men seem to expect that women in general should be grateful to men in general. For what? The individual woman may have cause to be grateful to her father, to her brother, to her husband; but few women have any cause to be grateful to man as a class. The conjecture may be hazarded that men get quite as much gratitude as they deserve—on the average. If grateful women are anti-suffragists, we must excuse the self-supporting women, at least, if they are not all opponents of votes for women.

In a state of nature the relation of man and woman is no doubt partnership; not an equal partnership in all respects, for there is separation of functions; some degree of subjection is natural to woman, since man is the stronger, but the subjection of the harem is as unnatural as the emancipation of Rome. But we have got so far from nature that nature is no longer a sufficient guide. Shall we then say that the historical relation of man to woman is partnership? That would be true, but less true of the nineteenth century than of those that preceded, less true of the twentieth century than of the

nineteenth. Let us say, the ideal relation of man and woman is partnership—a partnership as nearly equal as may be, in which each in giving way hardly knows that he or she is yielding, for the compulsion is so reasonable and right. By that partnership civilisation has been constantly advanced. It has often been observed that men living alone feed like animals and live like hogs ; women living alone live in decency but starve their bodies. If we are more dependent upon man for the necessaries of life, we are more dependent upon women for the decencies. The over-elaboration of our needs also comes to us from women, but that is an excess of their civilising zeal—a defect of their qualities. In such a partnership it will often happen that one will overreach the other ; it may be the man, it may be the woman ; who can say which more often filches the unjust share ? Men ruin women, women ruin men. Neither sex is without sin that it should dare to throw a stone at the other.

In a beautiful age, when all nevertheless was not so beautiful as it seems to us, man invented the ideal of chivalry. Sir Almroth Wright, who seems to be incapable of defining any word as others conceive its meaning, defines chivalry as a compact, *do ut des, facio ut facias.* Could any definition be more false ? The ideal of chivalry was that the strong should aid the weak, without reward and without price. The knight-errant, who roved the world defending the forlorn and the oppressed, did not demand payment even from those who could well afford it ; his chivalry was its own sufficient recompense. But there are many women who have no chance of partnership with man, ideal or prosaic, fair or unfair, subject or predominant ; no knowledge of any chivalry that will protect them, without payment claimed in return. It is fortunate for such women that they have in them ' arrhenoplasm ' as well as ' thelyplasm.' * The arrhenoplasm, when evident in women, may offend our delicate sensibili-

* Arrheno = male ; thely = female. According to Weininger, 'every single organ and every single cell possesses a sexuality lying somewhere between arrhenoplasm and thelyplasm ; and further, every cell received an original sexual endowment different in kind and degree.' This hypothesis is said to have received some experimental corroboration from later workers.

ties; but so do many other things that are quite necessary in this work-a-day world.

We cannot neglect nature, but in this matter nature gives us no complete instruction; we cannot neglect history, but history changes as we watch it; we cannot neglect prejudice, a very useful thing, though apt to lag behind the times; we cannot neglect custom, more valuable to us than law, more plastic, more helpful, more tolerant, though, like law, it is a second-hand garment. But, above all, we cannot safely disregard facts. This fact refuses to be disregarded, that there are millions of women who have to earn their own livelihood, and must, for that reason, abandon their womanly seclusion. They must associate with men, they must compete with men, they must, in working hours at least, forget that they are women. This may be quite as difficult for them as it is for Sir Almroth Wright to forget that the physician whom he is invited to meet in consultation is a woman. But it is only one of the many difficulties they have to face. Whatever else is or may not be chivalry, it is not chivalrous to put any needless obstacle in the way of a woman who does not choose, or has not the chance, to depend on the 'bounty' of man.

Concerning this sex which is being forced by circumstances to abandon its natural partnership with man and seek its own footing in the world, Sir Almroth has made a discovery. The women are insolvent; they do not pay their way; they should be grateful if they do not starve, still more if they live in ease or luxury—grateful to man, who 'makes' all the money. This sordid indictment is made for a political purpose, which we may neglect for the present to examine the charge.

In the first place, this notion of making money is crude and superficial; no one makes money; we acquire, we receive, we possess, we pay money; but our true solvency is to be reckoned, not by the margin of credit over debit in a banker's book, but by the excess value of the services we render over those which we receive. Judged by this standard there are many women who are insolvent, and there are also many men who are insolvent. Some of those who 'make' most money are most insolvent; their receipts are great and their services are null. To strike a balance between the sexes and to say that man gives more, woman receives more, or *vice versa*,

would require an exalted and impartial arbitrator free from all kinds of sex prejudice. A man cannot aspire to such impartiality; a woman cannot. Men and women are necessary to each other, necessary to civilisation, necessary to the race; and that is all that can be safely said.

But to return to money—that measure of commonplace values. Can it be justly said that married women are insolvent? Though chivalry has no contractual element, marriage is a contract, a contract of partnership; it may also be a holy and mysterious sacrament, but it is a contract as well. The terms of that business contract are still much what they were when the marriage service was framed. The man endows the woman with all his worldly goods. An unequal contract, it may be said; but it is a contract sanctioned by the experience of ages, a contract into which no man enters blindfold or without consent. It is the normal function of the husband to win or acquire the money; it is the function of the wife to spend it. It is quite as difficult to spend money well as it is to make it. There are millions of women who do it well; there are many who do it badly; there are some who do it very badly—just as there are men who perform their manly functions ill. But whether the woman does her spending well or ill, she cannot be called insolvent while the partnership itself is solvent. A partner who is invited to join a firm is not called insolvent because he supplies no capital. To this firm the woman is always invited; she is never the postulant, though she may sometimes manœuvre to be asked. Concern with finance belongs as much to those who manage money as to those who acquire it, and in the vast majority of cases the management of money falls to the wife, who is, as a rule, better fitted than the man to make a little go a long way. Married women cannot be called insolvent, unless by an abuse of terms.

Turn then to unmarried women, and first to those who have inherited money. These are insolvent, according to Sir Almroth, because they did not themselves make the money which they spend. This involves a new adjustment of our fixed ideas. No man will be solvent who did not 'make' the money which he spends. A very desirable state of affairs, it may be, but nothing short of a revolution will be required to bring it about. Sir Almroth hints that the House of

Peers was deprived of its last shred of authority over finance because the chief part of its members did not 'make' the money which they own. That is not true historically; whether it can be true in any esoteric sense, we may leave our readers to decide.

Then we come to the women who do earn their livelihood —they number millions. Surely they will be accounted solvent, if the Peers are not. No, says Sir Almroth; these ladies are insolvent because they earn so little. They may pay their own way, and save money, but they are insolvent, for they do not defray their full share of rates and taxes. It would be idle to tell Sir Almroth that the incidence of taxation is much too subtle and complicated a question to be settled by ascertaining who pays the taxes in the first instance—he has not thought such matters worthy of his attention. If we could trace out the whole stress of the burden we might very likely find that these women pay more than their full share. But, by this reasoning, all men who earn less than a certain amount are insolvent and should be deprived of their votes. New principles are invented at every turn in order to prove that women are insolvent and therefore should have no vote.

If the poverty of wage-earning women appears to Sir Almroth a reason why they should not vote, to many women it seems the most conclusive reason why the suffrage should be conceded. They believe that the possession of votes has been the cause and not merely the concomitant of the rise in men's wages. The subject is too obscure for dogmatic assertion, but instances can be found in which the men have attained results by the influence of their voting power which might not have been otherwise secured. Trade Unions have thus received privileges which any one of Sir Almroth's expert legislators—who ought no doubt to make our laws but do not—would have refused. The miners and the railway men have secured concessions by the benevolent interference of politicians not unmoved by an appetite for votes. But, since economic forces are stronger than legislation, more subtle than administrative ingenuity, more inexorable than custom, it may be worth while to consider the economic forces that are working chiefly against the women.

The first thing that is against the women is the rapid increase

of competition among women. The superfluity of women increases ; the marriage habit declines among men ; the marriage profession becomes less popular among women. A flood of women is let loose to struggle for the few occupations that are open to women. In this country, at least, women are not fit or are not considered fit for heavy manual and bodily labour. In the whole history of their sex women have never been machine makers. They have worked the loom, the spinning-wheel ; they now work similar machines, and also the sewing-machine and the typewriter, but they have never made the instruments ; they have not wielded the hammer, the saw, the chisel, or the file. Whether this be a true sex disability is not certain ; it may be due to custom and tradition ; but while the fact remains women are excluded from a great class of employments.

In the creative arts women seem to be inferior. The best woman is not so good a cook as the best man ; the best tailors for women are men. There has been no sufficient cause for many hundreds of years why a woman should not paint pictures, draw, etch, model, design, compose music, poetry, literature of all kinds. Yet the examples of feminine excellence in these lines are rare ; only in novel-writing can the women claim anything like an equality with men. Custom may have operated to diminish the competition of woman ; that bar has now been removed ; we may shortly be certain whether woman is intellectually and spiritually receptive rather than creative. But hitherto the highest prizes of the artistic career have only fallen—among women—to actresses, singers, and dancers.

In administration woman has not proved herself to be the equal of man. From many professions she is excluded by custom ; she cannot in this country be a priest, a barrister or a solicitor. But there has been nothing to prevent her from opening a shop or an hotel and developing a great business. On a small scale—especially in France—a certain kind of administrative ability is very common among women, but woman has seldom operated on a large scale. Custom no doubt tells here also ; the superior prestige of man weights the balance ; man is unwilling to take orders from a woman, disinclined to do business with a woman ; but it is reasonable to suppose that if the capacity of woman had been as great

as that of man she would have attained a larger share in the control of business.

Debarred from many occupations by custom, tradition, or sex disability, woman throws the whole weight of her competition on to those trades which are open to her; this pressure alone is sufficient to account for the low wages that women receive. Incidentally she forces down the wages of men where she meets their competition, and thus, perhaps, further increases the number of unmarried men, the superfluity of women. Where she can be compared with man, her wages still are lower. She is more docile, more eager to please, but she is also less robust; a sudden heavy stress may disconcert her; she is—rightly—not allowed to work at night in factories or workshops or to work much overtime. A butler is paid more than a parlour-maid, though he will not do more work, and may not do it better. He can command more wages because more trades are open to him as a man; employers are willing to pay more because of his superior dignity and prestige. In the same way, though a female nurse will work at night, a male nurse, who is employed for necessity, cannot be engaged for the same wage as a woman.

Let us put aside once and for all the fallacy that men are paid more because they may be supporting a wife and family. This kind of justice does not result from the operation of economic forces—though the Government might justify lower payments by such an argument. In business, when we engage a man we do not inquire whether he has a wife, or what his family may number, and then fix his wages. Bachelor or married, we pay him what he is worth in the market provided he is worth that sum to us. That is how wages are settled in the world of business. Economics have nothing to do with abstract justice; and all reasoning that endeavours to disguise this fact is fallacious. The man and the woman—each is paid what he or she can fetch in the market; unfortunately the prices for women run low; the market is against them, custom is against them, tradition is against them, prestige is against them. But they are not therefore insolvent; they pay their way; if they earn less they consume less; one way or another they shoulder their burden of life, even the burden of rates and taxes.

This is a pitiful story, and we are not sanguine that legislation will do much to improve it. Legislation in the economic field is like stirring water with a rake; you may move some of it, but the forces will flow round and about, and the general levels will remain the same. But the forces may change; customs change, traditions change, opinions change; new doors will open, new employments will be found; the influx of superfluous women will be gradually absorbed. Women's education for practical life needs much improvement; much is already being done to fit them for domestic life; more is needed to fit them for industrial and business life. It can no longer be assumed that the inevitable destiny of a woman is to be married; the figures give the lie to that assumption.

But meanwhile the bitterness engendered by this harsh and unequal competition puts venom into the feminist movement. Everywhere woman finds barriers that impede her progress; some of them may be necessary, some of them may be right, others may be desirable, but all of them are galling; and the struggling woman may be pardoned if she is unable to distinguish those barriers which should be maintained from others which are plainly the work of prejudice or of tradition and custom—which come to us from a different, perhaps a happier, state of things. She may be pardoned if she is not willing to wait until in due course the economic readjustment takes place by slow and gradual social change. If she be told in plain words that her company is not desired, that men prefer her room, that their delicate sensibilities are offended if they meet her in the act of earning her bread, sex hostility is the natural result. The problem is there, and it will not be made more easy by anger and contempt. Here, once again, men—even men of science—might do well to take more pains to understand the woman whom God gave to them. Good reason should be shown if woman is to be excluded from any legitimate occupation; if she is not fit for it she will not be employed, or she will be seldom employed, and no harm will be done.

Mrs. Colquhoun's book is admirably sane and even-tempered; she is much concerned with the rebellious spirit manifested by young women of the middle classes, and fostered in them by celibate teachers, ignorant of life. The higher education of women is a new thing; new learning flies to the head; new learning breaks up old ideas and old conventions; there

is a fluidity in the thoughts of the new woman which allows them to take almost any shape—some of them frankly anarchic and destructive. This fever must burn itself out; extended sex experience will teach its own lessons. Women have learnt that they can beat men in examinations; they have learnt that they have more gifts than they knew; only by experiment can they learn in what directions their gifts lead to excellence. Much individual disappointment, much personal disaster must be faced before the experiment is complete. At present the new woman is bent on proving herself the equal of man in all respects. It is doubtful, as Mrs. Colquhoun says, whether it is really good for any class of persons to indulge for any length of time in the contemplation of their own virtues, but a temporary excess of self-admiration may be pardoned. Woman is, no doubt, the equal of man in value, in some gifts superior, with others more penuriously equipped. She must test her own strength, and find her own limitations. Mrs. Colquhoun, a convinced evolutionist, calls upon her to do her duty to the race. But self-conscious duty to the race is for few a potent motive; nature and instinct must protect the race; when this excitement has subsided nature and instinct will come into their own.

Politics often act as a safety valve for passions that might otherwise be destructive. But these passions are too deeply seated to be exhausted in a political struggle. Their acrimony is now concentrated on the struggle for woman suffrage, but their roots are fixed in profounder regions. Yet the vote—if it were granted even in a limited form, so that the principle were admitted—would probably do much to assuage the feeling of injustice. It may therefore be worth while to consider on what grounds the suffrage can be demanded, and what effects might ensue if it were granted. However great the relief to feelings lacerated by apparent injustice, it will be agreed that the vote should not be given to women if it is not just to give it; it may even be suggested that, whether just or not, it should not be given if its consequences are likely to be disastrous. Self-preservation comes before justice as a final motive.

We agree that the vote should not be given as a concession to violence. It has been most unfortunate for the women that the policy of violence was ever adopted. It has turned

indifference into hostility ; it has made the women ridiculous ; it has lowered our opinion of their wisdom, for violence is not their weapon, nor can it ever be ; the violence of woman does not inspire fear ; and violence which fails in that fails altogether. We agree also that personal abuse has no compelling virtue ; cries of selfishness, want of chivalry, tyranny, prejudice, affect us not at all ; prejudices in particular may be good or bad, and a good prejudice ensures right conduct without the trouble of deliberation, for which there may not be leisure. Nor again need we fear to be declared illogical. Distinctions must be observed in conduct, which cannot be fully explained by logic. It was a great lawyer who said that the House of Lords must not be bound by the apparent consequences of its own decisions. Logic is a good engine of warfare but a bad guide. But when we come to justice and expediency we are on more solid ground.

We are not going to attempt a definition of justice. The greatest philosophers have attempted such a definition and have failed. It would be strange if Sir Almroth Wright had succeeded ; but he might have modestly refrained from the attempt. After a few words about legal justice, the kind of justice that is administered in a court of law—a very special, limited, and imperfect kind—he proceeds to lay down that justice must be conformable to the principle of utility and be directed to the advantage of society. ' The conception of ' justice is thus everywhere interfused with considerations ' of utility and expediency.' If he had said that justice is often frustrated, constantly frustrated, by considerations of utility and expediency, he would have been nearer the mark. The conflict between justice and expediency is one of the commonplaces of human life. Whoever said ' *fiat justitia, ruat* ' *caelum* ' represented one school of thought ; the more common is that which would have sent Dreyfus, though innocent, to the Île du Diable in order to save the prestige of the French army. The former is the more commendable, but surpasses the capacity of human virtue. In effect Sir Almroth Wright confuses justice with expediency, two antagonistic conceptions. This fusion assists his argument for the moment, but lays him open to the charge of discussing what he does not understand ; or, at least, of assuming a new philosophy which he does not expound.

Although it may be difficult to deliver a definition of justice that will truly represent the idea that lies in the heart of man, it may be conceded that equality is not justice—except where equals are concerned. But like treatment for like persons is one of the principles of justice; and one of the principles of democracy is equality in respect of the vote. We live under a system of representative democracy, which recognises all kinds of inequality—in position, in power, in authority, in wealth—but treats almost all men as equal for the vote, excluding on the other hand all women. Plural voting is an accident which can be put aside as a manifest anachronism. Excluding that, the theory of democracy is to ascertain the will of all by asking for the vote of each, to ascertain the will of the people by assuming that for this purpose the importance of every voter is the same as that of any other. All considerations of wealth, position, wisdom, learning, strength, usefulness, experience, personal service, are set aside; any man who has the legal qualification has a vote, and each vote is of equal importance in the constituency in which it is cast.

Now in asking the democratic question, Which candidate do you support? we cannot be asking for wisdom or guidance. If we were we should inquire of Mr. Balfour or Mr. Asquith, Lord Cromer or Lord Milner or Sir Edward Grey, Sir Oliver Lodge, Lord Halsbury, Lord Haldane, or Sir Almroth Wright. No sane person can suppose that the majority has any prerogative of wisdom; there are a thousand stupid people to one intelligent, ten thousand ordinary men to one who is wise. We equate all voters because in a sense their interests are all of equal importance to us; they all are or are assumed to be sane, law-abiding, solvent persons, and as a State we care for each of them equally. They may be right or they may be wrong; but their interests are at stake; and therefore we ask them all their opinion. That opinion settles one or two things; it does not directly settle much; but it has weight in legislation which does not matter much, in administration which matters more, and in the general trend of affairs which matters most. In this democratic equality all men, or nearly all men, share alike; but no woman counts at all. Women may speak on platforms, they may and do canvass, they may and do influence voters, they may and do win elections; but

no woman can vote. We need not be at the mercy of logic to hold that one of the principles of justice is proportionate treatment for similar claims. Admittedly women are not so great or strong or rich as men; but the difference between men and women must be less than the difference between something and nothing; the ratio must be less than infinity. Are the desires of nearly all men equal in the eyes of the State, and the desires of all women worth nothing?

We look for an explanation of this apparent inequality and we are told that women are insolvent and therefore they may not have any fraction of a fraction of a voice in the disposal of the few poor pennies that they may have paid to the State. Further we are told that society in the last resort is based upon force; women cannot exercise force, therefore it is unfit that they should command or countenance the exercise of force, and therefore they may not exercise the gentle compulsion of votes—a compulsion which quite breaks down where force comes in, as Ulster threatens to prove. Very well; in the last resort the men have the force; must they keep the votes also to themselves?

The principle of the suffrage seems to be that every man has an equal interest in the affairs of his country, and therefore his will should have equal weight in deciding what he can decide, which in the nature of things is not much for the average man. Has not every woman an equal interest in the affairs of her country? Must she remain in tutelage? If so, who is the guardian of the unmarried working women? If all women were married it might be supposed that their husbands would speak for them; it might even happen that in many cases the women would really decide the husbands' votes; but the unmarried working women have no man to speak for them. Yet the unmarried working woman is among other things a taxpayer. Anti-suffragists make light of the maxim, No taxation without representation; but it is a maxim that split an empire in twain and for which thousands laid down their lives.

Is it justice or expediency that forbids us to give the vote to women because, like some politicians, they do not always tell the truth? Is it as a punishment for their imperfect veracity, their white lies, their evasions and their circumventions, that they are to be excluded from politics? Or is it that they would

lower the average tone of politics, multiply the deceptions, complicate the inventions, falsify the frauds ? All these philosophers—Weininger, Schopenhauer, Almroth Wright—are agreed that women do not, cannot, do not wish to tell the truth. Dr. Havelock Ellis says that deception is almost physiological in women. Philosophy speaks ; science speaks ; but common sense decides the issue : not always endorsing the verdict of science or philosophy. But in any case it is not the part of voters to deceive ; that is the business of the candidate ; the business of the voter is to resist deception. If the women are such liars—we use the ' unexpurgated ' phrase—perhaps they may know one or two of the tricks of the trade, and may be able to recognise a falsehood when they hear one or read one ; and this is a quality which might be useful if they were voters.

Again we are told that it is just and it is expedient to exclude woman from the franchise because ' she arrives at conclusions ' on incomplete evidence ' ; ' she has a very imperfect sense of ' proportion ' ; ' mental images are in her over-intimately linked ' with emotional reflex responses ' ; she is incapable ' of forming ' anything that could pass muster as a great generalisation.' Yet surely every one of these phrases applies also to the average male voter. As to the further statement that she is unfit to vote because ' the belief of men in the inherent inferiority ' of women in the matter of intellectual morality, and in the ' power of adjudication, has never varied,' the simple and sufficient answer is that this great generalisation is untrue. How many men are there, and wise men too, who do not feel secure in their resolutions until they have submitted them to the judgment of a woman ? It is not only that such men trust to the intellectual honesty of women, it is not only that they believe in their power of adjudication, it is that they know they will get a different point of view, a different class of opinion from any that they are capable of framing themselves. This is perhaps the element of unreason which Sir Almroth Wright finds patent or hidden away in woman. If that be all, there is more than an element of unreason in every man ; but the point where a man fails to follow a woman's processes of thought is not always the point where she goes wrong—it is often the point where she is right and men are wrong. Wise women are as wise as wise men, but they are different ; and that is

why wise men consult them, and have consulted them from Numa downwards.

But we do not go to the voters for wisdom—if we did we might be disappointed; we go to them because we wish to know what they desire, for what they desire is a material element in our calculations. And this applies to women as well as to men; for it is not well that a considerable section of the community should be burning with a sense of injustice. As things are, we do not even know how large this section may be. Sir Almroth concedes to women the right to influence public opinion by the written and the spoken word; that is fortunate, since neither he nor anyone else can prevent it under the existing law; but in conceding that he concedes a more important right than the right—if it be a right—to cast a vote.

The real question of expediency is concerned with the use that women will make of the vote if they get it. And here it is the average woman that matters; not the individual, who may be wise or foolish; nor the type, which may be all that Weininger declares, since it does not exist. Take the standard work on Woman, that by Dr. Havelock Ellis. There is not much to be learned from it, for the nature of woman and the nature of man are not to be elucidated by the processes of science, by countings and by measurings, by weighing and analysing, but by the sympathy of mind with mind and by the hints of wise men who have by intuition understood woman and man.

But common opinions and wise opinions agree in one thing with Dr. Ellis's science; they agree in believing that women, more than men, are 'affectable,' prone to suggestion. The average woman does not form her own opinions; she takes them ready made; not from the last person who has harangued her, but from those whose influence has been continuous and steady, those who have spoken to her with recognised and legitimate authority. It would be rash to prophesy as to the line which the woman voter would take on certain questions: the drink question, questions of education, questions of constitution, of war and armaments. But it does not seem hazardous to suggest that the average woman will reflect even more closely than the average man the prevailing, the conventional, the traditional opinion of

society. And in that there can be no tremendous danger. This is borne out by Sir Almroth's own remarks; he admits, he almost complains, that the women voters of Australasia vote very much as their husbands and their brothers would desire. That is what one would expect; if it is so, why all this pother? What the men would have cause to dislike would be that the women should combine against them. But that there is no sound reason to anticipate. The interests, the prejudices of women are not fundamentally opposed to those of men. Just now there is an apparent opposition which cannot be regarded as normal; which would pass away with the abnormal circumstances.

There are one or two valid reasons against female suffrage which should in fairness be stated.

In the first place, there can be no doubt that in this country the great mass of women take little interest in politics. The young women are occupied with their laughter and their play, their clothes and their sweethearts. The elder women are occupied with their personal affairs—their homes, if they are married; their daily anxieties, if they are single. Let any of our readers amuse himself in his walks abroad by guessing how many of the women he sees are likely to be much concerned about the exercise of the vote, if they had it. He will not see one in ten that is likely to care two hat-pins about it: perhaps not one in twenty. Most women regard politics as a kind of foolishness which men play at. This reason against the vote is a reason of justice: it is not just that women should have the vote unless the majority of them come to care more about the questions decided by votes, which is quite different from being worked up into a frenzy for the vote itself. But it is not a reason of expediency, for it is not likely that these careless young women or these anxious women of middle age will take part in any revolutionary movement good or bad.

But at any rate, before the franchise is conceded to women we ought to be certain that a majority of women are ready to accept this new responsibility. Does any one think that at the present moment a majority of adult women would be found in the United Kingdom who cared enough for the franchise to cast a vote in favour of it? Therefore the first step for the advocates of women suffrage is to convert a majority of women to their view. The next step—and though at present

it seems the more difficult yet it would probably prove the easier—is the conversion of the male voters of the country to the same cause.

The question of votes for women must ultimately be decided by a majority of the existing voters. It would be dishonest for any group of politicians to carry a Bill through Parliament granting the suffrage to women unless it were believed that a majority of the existing voters were in favour of it. It would be impossible to do so if there were any strong feeling against it. There is such a feeling now—a feeling largely caused by the militant tactics, which may have been a good advertisement but are a very bad recommendation. The existing voters must first be persuaded to accept, if not to welcome, the addition to their number. That has not yet been done; and until it has been done no party politician, however ardent a supporter, will dare to take up the cause—even for the sake of a probable party advantage.

MARTIN CHALONER.

HENRI BEYLE

1. **Œuvres Complètes de Stendhal.** Vols. 1 and 2. Vie de HENRI BRULARD. Paris: Edouard Champion. 1913.
2. **Correspondance de Stendhal.** Publiée par AD. PAUPE et P. A. CHÉRAMY. Paris: Charles Bosse. 1908.
3. **Stendhal-Beyle.** Par ARTHUR CHUQUET. Paris: Plon-Nourrit. 1902.
4. **Soirées du Stendhal Club.** Par CASIMIR STRYIENSKI. Documents inédits. Paris: Société du Mercure de France. 1905.
5. **La Revue Critique des Idées et des Livres.** Paris: 10 Mars, 1913.
6. **Œuvres Complètes de Stendhal.** Paris: Calmann-Lévy.

IN the whole of French literature it would be difficult to point to a figure at once so important, so remarkable, and so little known to English readers as Henri Beyle. Most of us are, no doubt, fairly familiar with his pseudonym of 'Stendhal'; some of us have read 'Le Rouge et Le Noir' and 'La Chartreuse de Parme'; but how many of us have any further knowledge of a man whose works are at the present moment appearing in Paris in all the pomp of an elaborate and complete edition, every scrap of whose manuscripts is being collected and deciphered with enthusiastic care, and in honour of whose genius the literary periodicals of the hour are filling entire numbers with exegesis and appreciation? The eminent critic, M. André Gide, when asked lately to name the novel which stands in his opinion first among the novels of France, declared that since, without a doubt, the place belongs to one or other of the novels of Stendhal, his only difficulty was in making his choice among these; and he finally decided upon 'La Chartreuse de Parme.' According to this high authority, Henri Beyle was indisputably the creator of the greatest work of fiction in the French language, yet on this side of the Channel we have hardly more than heard of him! Nor is it merely as a writer that Beyle is admired in France. As a man, he seems to have come in, sixty or seventy years after his death, for a singular devotion. There are

'Beylistes,' or 'Stendhaliens,' who dwell with rapture upon every detail of the master's private life, who extend with pious care the long catalogue of his amorous adventures, who discuss the shades of his character with the warmth of personal friendship, and register his opinions with a zeal which is hardly less than sectarian. But indeed it is precisely in these extremes of his French devotees that we shall find a clue to the explanation of our own indifference. Beyle's mind contained, in a highly exaggerated form, most of the peculiarly distinctive elements of the French character. This does not mean that he was a typical Frenchman: far from it. He did not, like Voltaire or Hugo, strike a note to which the whole national genius vibrated in response. He has never been, it is unlikely that he ever will be, a popular writer. His literary reputation in France has been confined, until perhaps quite lately, to a small distinguished circle. 'On me lira,' he was fond of saying, 'vers 1880'; and the 'Beylistes' point to the remark in triumph as one further proof of the almost divine prescience of the great man. But in truth Beyle was always read by the *élite* of French critics and writers—'the happy few,' as he used to call them; and among these he has never been without enthusiastic admirers. During his lifetime Balzac, in an enormous eulogy of 'La Chartreuse de Parme,' paid him one of the most magnificent compliments ever received by a man of letters from a fellow craftsman. In the next generation Taine declared himself his disciple; a little later—'vers 1880,' in fact—we find Zola describing him as 'notre père à tous'; and M. Bourget followed with elaborate incense. To-day we have writers of such different tendencies as M. Barrès and M. Gide acclaiming him as a supreme master, and the fashionable idolatry of the 'Beylistes.' Yet, at the same time, running parallel to this stream of homage, it is easy to trace a line of opinion of a totally different kind. It is the opinion of the more solid, the more middle-class elements of French life. Thus Sainte-Beuve, in two characteristic 'Lundis,' poured a great deal of very tepid water upon Balzac's flaming panegyric. Then Flaubert—'vers 1880,' too—confessed that he could see very little in Stendhal. And, only a few years ago, M. Chuquet, of the Institute, took the trouble to compose a thick book in which he has collected with scrupulous detail all the known facts concerning the life and writings of a man whom he forthwith

proceeds to damn through five hundred pages of faint praise. These discrepancies are curious : how can we account for such odd differences of taste ? How are we to reconcile the admiration of Balzac with the dislike of Flaubert, the raptures of M. Bourget and M. Barrès with the sniffs of Sainte-Beuve and M. Chuquet of the Institute ? The explanation seems to be that Beyle occupies a position in France analogous to that of Shelley in England. Shelley is not a national hero, not because he lacked the distinctive qualities of an Englishman, but for the opposite reason—because he possessed so many of them in an extreme degree. The idealism, the daring, the imagination, and the unconventionality which give Shakespeare, Nelson, and Dr. Johnson their place in our pantheon—all these were Shelley's, but they were his in too undiluted and intense a form, with the result that, while he will never fail of worshippers among us, there will also always be Englishmen unable to appreciate him at all. Such, *mutatis mutandis*—and in this case the proviso is a very large one—is the position of Beyle in France. After all, when Bunthorne asked for a not-too-French French bean he showed more commonsense than he intended. Beyle *is* a too-French French writer—too French even for the bulk of his own compatriots ; and so for us it is only natural that he should be a little difficult. Yet this very fact is in itself no bad reason for giving him some attention. An understanding of this very Gallic individual might give us a new insight into the whole strange race. And besides, the curious creature is worth looking at for his own sake too.

But, when one tries to catch him and pin him down on the dissecting-table, he turns out to be exasperatingly elusive. Even his most fervent admirers cannot agree among themselves as to the true nature of his achievements. Balzac thought of him as an artist, Taine was captivated by his conception of history, M. Bourget adores him as a psychologist, M. Barrès lays stress upon his ' sentiment d'honneur,' and the ' Beylistes ' see in him the embodiment of modernity. Certainly very few writers have had the good fortune to appeal at once so constantly and in so varied a manner to succeeding generations as Henri Beyle. The circumstances of his life no doubt in part account for the complexity of his genius. He was born in 1783, when the *ancien régime* was still in full swing ; his early manhood was spent in the turmoil of the Napoleonic wars ; he

lived to see the Bourbon reaction, the Romantic revival, the revolution of 1830, and the establishment of Louis Philippe; and when he died, at the age of sixty, the nineteenth century was nearly half-way through. Thus his life exactly spans the interval between the old world and the new. His family, which belonged to the magistracy of Grenoble, preserved the living tradition of the eighteenth century. His grandfather was a polite, amiable, periwigged sceptic after the manner of Fontenelle, who always spoke of 'M. de Voltaire' with a smile 'mélangé 'de respect et d'affection;' and when the Terror came, two representatives of the people were sent down to Grenoble, with the result that Beyle's father was pronounced (with a hundred and fifty others) 'notoirement suspect' of disaffection to the Republic, and confined to his house. At the age of sixteen Beyle arrived in Paris, just after the *coup d'état* of the 18th Brumaire had made Bonaparte First Consul, and he immediately came under the influence of his cousin Daru, that extraordinary man to whose terrific energies was due the organisation of Napoleon's greatest armies, and whose leisure moments—for apparently he had leisure moments—were devoted to the composition of idylls in the style of Tibullus and to an enormous correspondence on literary topics with the poetasters of the day. It was as a subordinate to this remarkable personage that Beyle spent nearly the whole of the next fifteen years of his life—in Paris, in Italy, in Germany, in Russia—wherever the whirling tempest of the Napoleonic policy might happen to carry him. His actual military experience was considerably slighter than what, in after years, he liked to give his friends to understand it had been. For hardly more than a year, during the Italian campaign, he was in the army as a lieutenant of dragoons: the rest of his public service was spent in the commissariat department. The descriptions which he afterwards delighted to give of his adventures at Marengo, at Jéna, at Wagram, or at the crossing of the Niémen have been shown by M. Chuquet's unkind researches to have been imaginary. Beyle was present at only one great battle—Bautzen. 'Nous voyons fort bien,' he wrote in his journal on the following day, 'de midi à trois 'heures, tout ce qu'on peut voir d'une bataille, c'est à dire 'rien.' He was, however, at Moscow in 1812, and he accompanied the army through the horrors of the retreat. When the conflagration had broken out in the city, he had abstracted

from one of the deserted palaces a finely bound copy of the 'Facéties' of Voltaire; the book helped to divert his mind as he lay crouched by the camp-fire through the terrible nights that followed; but, as his companions showed their disapproval of anyone who could smile over Akakia and Pompignan in such a situation, one day he left the red-morocco volume behind him in the snow.

The fall of Napoleon threw Beyle out of employment, and the period of his literary activity began. His books were not successful; his fortune gradually dwindled; and he drifted in Paris and Italy, and even in England, more and more disconsolately, with thoughts of suicide sometimes in his head. But in 1830 the tide of his fortunes turned. The revolution of July, by putting his friends into power, brought him a competence in the shape of an Italian consulate; and in the same year he gained for the first time some celebrity by the publication of 'Le Rouge et Le Noir.' The rest of his life was spent in the easy discharge of his official duties at Cività Vecchia, alternating with periods of leave—one of them lasted for three years—spent in Paris among his friends, of whom the most distinguished was Prosper Mérimée. In 1839 appeared his last published work—'La Chartreuse de Parme'; and three years later he died suddenly in Paris. His epitaph, composed by himself with the utmost care, was as follows:

QUI GIACE
ARRIGO BEYLE MILANESE
VISSE, SCRISSE, AMÒ.

The words, read rightly, indicate many things—his adoration of Italy and Milan, his eccentricity, his scorn of the conventions of society and the limits of nationality, his adventurous life, his devotion to literature, and, lastly, the fact that, through all the varieties of his experience—in the earliest years of his childhood, in his agitated manhood, in his calm old age—there had never been a moment when he was not in love.

Beyle's work falls into two distinct groups—the first consisting of his novels, and the second of his miscellaneous writings, which include several biographies, a dissertation on Love, some books of criticism and travel, his letters and various autobiographical fragments. The bulk of the latter

group is large; much of it has only lately seen the light; and more of it, at present in MS. at the Library of Grenoble, is promised us by the indefatigable editors of the new complete edition which is now appearing in Paris. The interest of this portion of Beyle's writings is almost entirely personal: that of his novels is mainly artistic. It was as a novelist that Beyle first gained his celebrity, and it is still as a novelist—or rather as the author of 'Le Rouge et Le Noir' and 'La 'Chartreuse de Parme'' (for an earlier work, 'Armance,' some short stories, and some later posthumous fragments may be left out of account)—that he is most widely known to-day. Those two remarkable works lose none of their significance if we consider the time at which they were composed. It was in the full flood of the Romantic revival, that marvellous hour in the history of French literature when the tyranny of two centuries was shattered for ever, and a boundless wealth of inspirations, possibilities, and beauties before undreamt-of suddenly burst upon the view. It was the hour of Hugo, Vigny, Musset, Gautier, Balzac, with their new sonorities and golden cadences, their new lyric passion and dramatic stress, their new virtuosities, their new impulse towards the strange and the magnificent, their new desire for diversity and the manifold comprehension of life. But, if we turn to the contemporaneous pages of Stendhal, what do we find? We find a succession of colourless, unemphatic sentences; we find cold reasoning and exact narrative; we find polite irony and dry wit. The spirit of the eighteenth century is everywhere; and if the old gentleman with the perruque and the 'M. de Voltaire' could have taken a glance at his grandson's novels, he would have rapped his snuff-box and approved. It is true that Beyle joined the ranks of the Romantics for a moment with a *brochure* attacking Racine at the expense of Shakespeare; but this was merely one of those contradictory changes of front which were inherent in his nature; and in reality the whole Romantic movement meant nothing to him. There is a story of a meeting in the house of a common friend between him and Hugo, in which the two men faced each other, like a couple of cats with their backs up and their whiskers bristling. No wonder! But Beyle's true attitude towards his great contemporaries was hardly even one of hostility: he simply could not open their

books. As for Chateaubriand, the god of their idolatry, he loathed him like poison. He used to describe how, in his youth, he had been on the point of fighting a duel with an officer who had ventured to maintain that a phrase in 'Atala' —'la cime indéterminée des forêts'—was not intolerable. Probably he was romancing (M. Chuquet says so); but at any rate the story sums up symbolically Beyle's attitude towards his art. To him the whole apparatus of 'fine writing' —the emphatic phrase, the picturesque epithet, the rounded rhythm—was anathema. The charm that such ornaments might bring was in reality only a cloak for loose thinking and feeble observation. Even the style of the eighteenth century was not quite his ideal: it was too elegant; there was an artificial neatness about the form which imposed itself upon the substance, and degraded it. No, there was only one example of the perfect style, and that was the *Code Napoléon*; for there alone everything was subordinated to the exact and complete expression of what was to be said. A statement of law can have no place for irrelevant beauties, or the vagueness of personal feeling; by its very nature, it must resemble a sheet of plate glass through which every object may be seen with absolute distinctness, in its true shape. Beyle declared that he was in the habit of reading several paragraphs of the Code every morning after breakfast 'pour prendre le ton.' This again was for long supposed to be one of his little jokes; but quite lately the searchers among the MSS. at Grenoble have discovered page after page copied out from the Code in Beyle's handwriting. No doubt, for that wayward lover of paradoxes, the real joke lay in everybody taking for a joke what *he* took quite seriously.

This attempt to reach the exactitude and the detachment of an official document was not limited to Beyle's style; it runs through the whole tissue of his work. He wished to present life dispassionately and intellectually, and if he could have reduced his novels to a series of mathematical symbols, he would have been charmed. The contrast between his method and that of Balzac is remarkable. That wonderful art of materialisation, of the sensuous evocation of the forms, the qualities, the very stuff and substance of things, which was perhaps Balzac's greatest discovery, Beyle neither possessed nor wished to possess. Such matters were to him of the

most subordinate importance, which it was no small part of the novelist's duty to keep very severely in their place. In the earlier chapters of 'Le Rouge et Le Noir,' for instance, he is concerned with almost the same subject as Balzac in the opening of 'Les Illusions Perdues'—the position of a young man in a provincial town, brought suddenly from the humblest surroundings into the midst of the leading society of the place through his intimate relations with a woman of refinement. But while in Balzac's pages what emerges is the concrete vision of provincial life down to the last pimple on the nose of the lowest footman, Beyle concentrates his whole attention on the personal problem, hints in a few rapid strokes at what Balzac has spent all his genius in describing, and reveals to us instead, with the precision of a surgeon at an operation, the inmost fibres of his hero's mind. In fact, Beyle's method is the classical method—the method of selection, of omission, of unification, with the object of creating a central impression of supreme reality. Zola criticises him for disregarding 'le milieu.'

'Il y a' [he says] 'un épisode célèbre dans "Le Rouge et Le Noir," la scène où Julien, assis un soir à côté de Mme. de Rénal, sous les branches noires d'un arbre, se fait un devoir de lui prendre la main, pendant qu'elle cause avec Mme. Derville. C'est un petit drame muet d'une grande puissance, et Stendhal y a analysé merveilleusement les états d'âme de ses deux personnages. Or, le milieu n'apparaît pas une seule fois. Nous pourrions être n'importe où dans n'importe quelles conditions, la scène resterait la même, pourvu qu'il fît noir. . . . Donnez l'épisode à un écrivain pour qui les milieux existent, et dans la défaite de cette femme, il fera entrer la nuit, avec ses odeurs, avec ses voix, avec ses voluptés molles. Et cet écrivain sera dans la vérité, son tableau sera plus complet.'

More complete, perhaps; but would it be more convincing? Zola, with his statistical conception of art, could not understand that you could tell a story properly unless you described in detail every contingent fact. He could not see that Beyle was able, by simply using the symbol 'nuit,' to suggest the 'milieu' at once to the reader's imagination. Everybody knows all about the night's accessories—'ses odeurs, ses voix, 'ses voluptés molles'; and what a relief it is to be spared, for once in a way, an elaborate expatiation upon them! And Beyle is perpetually evoking the gratitude of his readers in

this way. 'Comme il insiste peu!' as M. Gide exclaims. Perhaps the best test of a man's intelligence is his capacity for making a summary. Beyle knew this, and his novels are full of passages which read like nothing so much as extraordinarily able summaries of some enormous original narrative which has been lost.

It was not that he was lacking in observation, that he had no eye for detail, or no power of expressing it; on the contrary, his vision was of the sharpest, and his pen could call up pictorial images of startling vividness, when he wished. But he very rarely did wish: it was apt to involve a tiresome insistence. In his narratives he is like a brilliant talker in a sympathetic circle, skimming swiftly from point to point, taking for granted the intelligence of his audience, not afraid here and there to throw out a vague 'etc.' when the rest of the sentence is too obvious to state; always plain of speech, never self-assertive, and taking care above all things never to force the note. His famous description of the Battle of Waterloo in 'La Chartreuse de Parme' is certainly the finest example of this side of his art. Here he produces an indelible impression by a series of light touches applied with unerring skill. Unlike Zola, unlike Tolstoi, he shows us neither the loathsomeness nor the devastation of a battlefield, but its insignificance, its irrelevant detail, its unmeaning grotesquenesses and indignities, its incoherence, and its empty weariness. Remembering his own experience at Bautzen, he has made his hero—a young Italian impelled by Napoleonic enthusiasm to join the French army as a volunteer on the eve of the battle—go through the great day in such a state of vague perplexity that in the end he can never feel quite certain that he really *was* at Waterloo. He experiences a succession of trivial and unpleasant incidents, culminating in his being hoisted off his horse by two of his comrades, in order that a general, who has had his own shot from under him, might be supplied with a mount; for the rest, he crosses and recrosses some fields, comes upon a dead body in a ditch, drinks brandy with a *vivandière*, gallops over a field covered with dying men, has an indefinite skirmish in a wood—and it is over. At one moment, having joined the escort of some generals, the young man allows his horse to splash into a stream, thereby covering one of the generals with muddy water from head to foot. The

passage that follows is a good specimen of Beyle's narrative style :

' En arrivant sur l'autre rive, Fabrice y avait trouvé les généraux tout seuls ; le bruit du canon lui sembla redoubler ; ce fut à peine s'il entendit le général, par lui si bien mouillé, qui criait à son oreille :

—Où as-tu pris ce cheval ?

Fabrice était tellement troublé, qu'il répondit en Italien :

—*L'ho comprato poco fa.* (Je viens de l'acheter à l'instant.)

—Que dis-tu ? lui cria le général.

Mais le tapage devint tellement fort en ce moment, que Fabrice ne put lui répondre. Nous avouerons que notre héros était fort peu héros en ce moment. Toutefois, la peur ne venait chez lui qu'en seconde ligne ; il était surtout scandalisé de ce bruit qui lui faisait mal aux oreilles. L'escorte prit le galop ; on traversait une grande pièce de terre labourée, située au delà du canal, et ce champ était jonché de cadavres.'

How unemphatic it all is ! What a paucity of epithet, what a reticence in explanation ! How a Romantic would have lingered over the facial expression of the general, and how a Naturalist would have analysed that ' tapage ' ! And yet, with all their efforts, would they have succeeded in conveying that singular impression of disturbance, of cross-purposes, of hurry, and of ill-defined fear, which Beyle with his quiet terseness has produced ?

It is, however, in his psychological studies that the detached and intellectual nature of Beyle's method is most clearly seen. When he is describing, for instance, the development of Julien Sorel's mind in ' Le Rouge et Le Noir '—when he shows us the soul of the young peasant with its ignorance, its ambition, its pride, going step by step into the whirling vortex of life—then we seem to be witnessing not so much the presentment of a fiction as the unfolding of some scientific fact. The procedure is almost mathematical : a proposition is established, the inference is drawn, the next proposition follows, and so on until the demonstration is complete. Here the influence of the eighteenth century is very strongly marked. Beyle had drunk deeply of that fountain of syllogism and analysis that flows through the now forgotten pages of Helvétius and Condillac ; he was an ardent votary of Logic in its austerest form—' la Lo-gique ' he used to call it, dividing the syllables in a kind of awe-inspired emphasis ; and he considered the

ratiocinative style of Montesquieu almost as good as that of the *Code Civil*.

If this had been all, if we could sum him up simply as an acute and brilliant writer who displays the scientific and prosaic sides of the French genius in an extreme degree, Beyle's position in literature would present very little difficulty. He would take his place at once as a late—an abnormally late—product of the eighteenth century. But he was not that. In his blood there was a virus which had never tingled in the veins of Voltaire. It was the virus of modern life—that new sensibility, that new passionateness, which Rousseau had first made known to the world, and which had won its way over Europe behind the thunder of Napoleon's artillery. Beyle had passed his youth within earshot of that mighty roar, and his inmost spirit could never lose the echo of it. It was in vain that he studied Condillac and modelled his style on the Code; in vain that he sang the praises of *la Lo-gique*, shrugged his shoulders at the Romantics, and turned the cold eye of a scientific investigator upon the phenomena of life; he remained essentially a man of feeling. His unending series of *grandes passions* was one unmistakeable sign of this: another was his intense devotion to the Fine Arts. Though his taste in music and painting was the taste of his time—the literary and sentimental taste of the age of Rossini and Canova—he nevertheless brought to the appreciation of works of art a kind of intimate gusto which reveals the genuineness of his emotion. The 'jouissances d'ange,' with which at his first entrance into Italy he heard at Novara the 'Matrimonio 'Segreto' of Cimarosa, marked an epoch in his life. He adored Mozart: 'I can imagine nothing more distasteful to 'me,' he said, 'than a thirty-mile walk through the mud; 'but I would take one at this moment if I knew that I should 'hear a good performance of "Don Giovanni" at the end of it.' The virgins of Guido Reni sent him into ecstasies and the Goddesses of Correggio into raptures. In short, as he himself admitted, he never could resist 'le Beau' in whatever form he found it. *Le Beau!* The phrase is characteristic of the peculiar species of ingenuous sensibility which so oddly agitated this sceptical man of the world. His whole vision of life was coloured by it. His sense of values was impregnated with what he called his 'espagnolisme'—his immense admiration

for the noble and the high-resounding in speech or act or character—an admiration which landed him often enough in hysterics and absurdity. Yet this was the soil in which a temperament of caustic reasonableness had somehow implanted itself. The contrast is surprising, because it is so extreme. Other men have been by turns sensible and enthusiastic: but who before or since has combined the emotionalism of a schoolgirl with the cold penetration of a judge on the bench? Beyle, for instance, was capable of writing, in one of those queer epitaphs of himself which he was constantly composing, the high-falutin' words 'Il respecta un seul homme: 'Napoléon'; and yet, as he wrote them, he must have remembered well enough that when he met Napoleon face to face his unabashed scrutiny had detected swiftly that the man was a play-actor, and a vulgar one at that. Such were the contradictions of his double nature, in which the elements, instead of being mixed, came together, as it were, in layers, like superimposed strata of chalk and flint.

In his novels this cohabitation of opposites is responsible both for what is best and what is worst. When the two forces work in unison the result is sometimes of extraordinary value —a product of a kind which it would be difficult to parallel in any other author. An eye of icy gaze is turned upon the tumultuous secrets of passion, and the pangs of love are recorded in the language of Euclid. The image of the surgeon inevitably suggests itself—the hand with the iron nerve and the swift knife laying bare the trembling mysteries within. It is the intensity of Beyle's observation, joined with an exactitude of exposition, that makes his dry pages sometimes more thrilling than the wildest tale of adventure or all the marvels of high romance. The passage in 'La Chartreuse de 'Parme' describing Count Mosca's jealousy has this quality, which appears even more clearly in the chapters of 'Le Rouge 'et Le Noir' concerning Julien Sorel and Mathilde de la Mole. Here Beyle has a subject after his own heart. The loves of the peasant youth and the aristocratic girl, traversed and agitated by their overweening pride, and triumphing at last rather over themselves than over each other—these things make up a gladiatorial combat of 'espagnolismes,' which is displayed to the reader with a supreme incisiveness. The climax is reached when Mathilde at last gives way to her

passion, and throws herself into the arms of Julien, who forces himself to make no response :

' Ses bras se roidirent, tant l'effort imposé par la politique était pénible. Je ne dois pas même me permettre de presser contre mon cœur ce corps souple et charmant ; ou elle me méprise, ou elle me maltraite. Quel affreux caractère !

Et en maudissant le caractère de Mathilde, il l'en aimait cent fois plus ; il lui semblait avoir dans ses bras une reine.

L'impassible froideur de Julien redoubla le malheur de Mademoiselle de la Mole. Elle était loin d'avoir le sang-froid nécessaire pour chercher à deviner dans ses yeux ce qu'il sentait pour elle en cet instant. Elle ne put se résoudre à le regarder ; elle tremblait de rencontrer l'expression du mépris.

Assise sur le divan de la bibliothèque, immobile et la tête tournée du côté opposé à Julien, elle était en proie aux plus vives douleurs que l'orgueil et l'amour puissent faire éprouver à une âme humaine. Dans quelle atroce démarche elle venait de tomber !

Il m'était réservé, malheureuse que je suis ! de voir repoussées les avances les plus indécentes ! et repoussées par qui ? ajoutait l'orgueil fou de douleur, repoussées par un domestique de mon père.

C'est ce que je ne souffrirai pas, dit-elle à haute voix.'

At that moment she suddenly sees some unopened letters addressed to Julien by another woman.

'—Ainsi, s'écria-t-elle hors d'elle-même, non seulement vous êtes bien avec elle, mais encore vous la méprisez. Vous, un homme de rien, mépriser Madame la Maréchale de Fervaques !

—Ah ! pardon, mon ami, ajouta-t-elle en se jetant à ses genoux, méprise-moi si tu veux, mais aime-moi, je ne puis plus vivre privée de ton amour. Et elle tomba tout à fait évanouie.

—La voilà donc, cette orgueilleuse, à mes pieds ! se dit Julien.'

Such is the opening of this wonderful scene, which contains the concentrated essence of Beyle's genius, and which, in its combination of high passion, intellectual intensity and dramatic force, may claim comparison with the great dialogues of Corneille.

' Je fais tous les efforts possibles pour être *sec*,' he says of himself. ' Je veux imposer silence à mon cœur, qui croit ' avoir beaucoup à dire. Je tremble toujours de n'avoir ' écrit qu'un soupir, quand je crois avoir noté une vérité.' Often he succeeds, but not always. At times his desire for dryness becomes a mannerism and fills whole pages with tedious and obscure argumentation. And, at other times, his sensibility gets the upper hand, throws off all control, and

revels in an orgy of melodrama and 'espagnolisme.' Do what he will, he cannot keep up a consistently critical attitude towards the creatures of his imagination: he depreciates his heroes with extreme care, but in the end they get the better of him and sweep him off his feet. When, in 'La Chartreuse de Parme,' Fabrice kills a man in a duel, his first action is to rush to a looking-glass to see whether his beauty has been injured by a cut in the face; and Beyle does not laugh at this; he is impressed by it. In the same book he lavishes all his art on the creation of the brilliant, worldly, sceptical Duchesse de Sanseverina, and then, not quite satisfied, he makes her concoct and carry out the murder of the reigning Prince in order to satisfy a desire for amorous revenge. This really makes her perfect. But the most striking example of Beyle's inability to resist the temptation of sacrificing his head to his heart is in the conclusion of 'Le Rouge et Le Noir,' where Julien, to be revenged on a former mistress who defames him, deliberately goes down into the country, buys a pistol, and shoots the lady in church. Not only is Beyle entranced by the *bravura* of this senseless piece of brutality, but he destroys at a blow the whole atmosphere of impartial observation which fills the rest of the book, lavishes upon his hero the blindest admiration, and at last, at the moment of Julien's execution, even forgets himself so far as to write a sentence in the romantic style: 'Jamais cette tête n'avait été aussi poétique qu'au moment où elle allait tomber.' Just as Beyle, in his contrary mood, carries to an extreme the French love of logical precision, so in these rhapsodies he expresses in an exaggerated form a very different but an equally characteristic quality of his compatriots—their instinctive responsiveness to fine poses. It is a quality that Englishmen in particular find it hard to sympathise with. They remain stolidly unmoved when their neighbours are in ecstasies. They are repelled by the 'noble' rhetoric of the French Classical Drama; they find the tirades of Napoleon, which animated the armies of France to victory, pieces of nauseous clap-trap. And just now it is this side—to us the obviously weak side—of Beyle's genius that seems to be most in favour with French critics. To judge from M. Barrès, writing dithyrambically of Beyle's 'sentiment d'honneur,' that is his true claim to greatness. The sentiment of honour is all

very well, one is inclined to mutter on this side of the Channel ; but oh, for a little sentiment of humour too !

The view of Beyle's personality which his novels give us may be seen with far greater detail in his miscellaneous writings. It is to these that his most modern admirers devote their main attention—particularly to his letters and his autobiographies ; but they are all of them highly characteristic of their author, and—whatever the subject may be, from a guide to Rome to a life of Napoleon—one gathers in them, scattered up and down through their pages, a curious, dimly-adumbrated philosophy—an ill-defined and yet intensely personal point of view—*le Beylisme*. It is in fact almost entirely in this secondary quality that their interest lies ; their ostensible subject-matter is unimportant. An apparent exception is the book in which Beyle has embodied his reflections upon Love. The volume, with its meticulous apparatus of analysis, definition, and classification, which gives it the air of being a parody of ' L'Esprit des Lois,' is yet full of originality, of lively anecdote and keen observation. Nobody but Beyle could have written it ; nobody but Beyle could have managed to be at once so stimulating and so jejune, so clear-sighted and so exasperating. But here again, in reality, it is not the question at issue that is interesting—one learns more of the true nature of Love in one or two of La Bruyère's short sentences than in all Beyle's three hundred pages of disquisition ; but what is absorbing is the sense that comes to one, as one reads it, of the presence, running through it all, of a restless and problematical spirit. ' Le Beylisme ' is certainly not susceptible of any exact definition ; its author was too capricious, too unmethodical, in spite of his *lo-gique*, ever to have framed a coherent philosophy ; it is essentially a thing of shreds and patches, of hints, suggestions, and quick visions of flying thoughts. M. Barrès says that what lies at the bottom of it is a ' passion de collectionner les belles énergies.' But there are many kinds of ' belles énergies,' and some of them certainly do not fit into the framework of ' le ' Beylisme.' ' Quand je suis arrêté par des voleurs, ou qu'on ' me tire des coups de fusil, je me sens une grande colère contre ' le gouvernement et le curé de l'endroit. Quant au voleur, ' il me plaît, s'il est énergique, car il m'amuse.' It was the energy of self-assertiveness that pleased Beyle ; that of self-

restraint did not interest him. The immorality of the point of view is patent, and at times it appears to be simply based upon the common selfishness of an egotist. But in reality it was something more significant than that. The 'chasse au 'bonheur' which Beyle was always advocating was no respectable epicureanism; it had about it a touch of the fanatical. There was anarchy in it—a hatred of authority, an impatience with custom, above all a scorn for the commonplace dictates of ordinary morality. Writing his memoirs at the age of fifty-two, Beyle looked back with pride on the joy that he had felt, as a child of ten, amid his royalist family at Grenoble, when the news came of the execution of Louis XVI. His father announced it:

'—C'en est fait, dit-il avec un gros soupir, ils l'ont assassiné. Je fus saisi d'un des plus vifs mouvements de joie que j'ai éprouvé en ma vie. Le lecteur pensera peut-être que je suis cruel, mais tel j'étais à 5×2, tel je suis à $10 \times 5 + 2$. . . . Je puis dire que l'approbation des êtres, que je regarde comme faibles, m'est absolument indifférente.'

These are the words of a born rebel, and such sentiments are constantly recurring in his books. He is always discharging his shafts against some established authority; and, of course, he reserved his bitterest hatred for the proudest and most insidious of all authorities—the Roman Catholic Church. It is odd to find some of the 'Beylistes' solemnly hailing the man whom the power of the Jesuits haunted like a nightmare, and whose account of the seminary in 'Le Rouge et Le Noir' is one of the most scathing pictures of religious tyranny ever drawn, as a prophet of the present Catholic movement in France. For in truth, if Beyle was a prophet of anything he was a prophet of that spirit of revolt in modern thought which first reached a complete expression in the extraordinary pages of Nietzsche. His love of power and self-will, his aristocratic outlook, his scorn of the Christian virtues, his admiration of the Italians of the Renaissance, his repudiation of the herd and the morality of the herd—these qualities, flashing strangely among his observations on Rossini and the Coliseum, his reflections on the memories of the past and his musings on the ladies of the present, certainly give a surprising fore-taste of the fiery potion of Zarathustra. The creator of the Duchesse de Sanseverina had caught more than a glimpse of the

transvaluation of all values. Characteristically enough, the appearance of this new potentiality was only observed by two contemporary forces in European society—Goethe and the Austrian police. It is clear that Goethe alone among the critics of the time understood that Beyle was something more than a novelist, and discerned an uncanny significance in his pages. 'I do not like reading M. de Stendhal,' he observed to Winckelmann, 'but I cannot help doing so. He is extremely 'free and extremely impertinent, and . . . I recommend you 'to buy all his books.' As for the Austrian police, they had no doubt about the matter. Beyle's book of travel, 'Rome, 'Naples et Florence,' was, they decided, pernicious and dangerous in the highest degree; and the poor man was hunted out of Milan in consequence.

It would be a mistake to suppose that Beyle displayed in his private life the qualities of the superman. Neither his virtues nor his vices were on the grand scale. In his own person he never seems to have committed an 'espagnolisme.' Perhaps his worst sin was that of plagiarism: his earliest book, a life of Haydn, was almost entirely 'lifted' from the work of a learned German; and in his next he embodied several choice extracts culled, curiously enough, from the pages of this Review. On this occasion he was particularly delighted, since the 'Edinburgh,' in reviewing the book, innocently selected for special approbation the very passages which he had stolen. It is singular that so original a writer should have descended to pilfering; but Beyle was nothing if not inconsistent. With all his Classicism he detested Racine; with all his love of music he could see nothing in Beethoven; he adored Italy, and, so soon as he was given his Italian consulate, he was usually to be found in Paris. As his life advanced he grew more and more wayward, capricious, and eccentric. He indulged in queer mystifications, covering his papers with false names and anagrams—for the police, he said, were on his track, and he must be careful. His love-affairs became less and less fortunate; but he was still sometimes successful, and when he was he registered the fact—upon his braces. He dreamed and drifted a great deal. He went up to San Pietro in Montorio, and, looking over Rome, wrote the initials of his past mistresses in the dust. He tried to make up his mind whether Napoleon after all *was* the only being he

respected; no—there was also Mademoiselle de Lespinasse. He went to the opera at Naples and noted that 'la musique 'parfaite, comme la pantomime parfaite, me fait songer à ce qui 'forme actuellement l'objet de mes rêveries et me fait venir des 'idées excellentes: . . . or, ce soir, je ne puis me dissimuler 'que j'ai le malheur *of being too great an admirer of Lady L. . . .*' He abandoned himself to 'les charmantes visions du Beau qui 'souvent encore remplissent ma tête à l'âge de *fifty-two*.' He wondered whether Montesquieu would have thought his writings worthless. He sat scribbling his reminiscences by the fire till the night drew on and the fire went out, and still he scribbled, more and more illegibly, until at last the paper was covered with hieroglyphics undecipherable even by M. Chuquet himself. He wandered among the ruins of ancient Rome, playing to perfection the part of cicerone to such travellers as were lucky enough to fall in with him; and often his stout and jovial form, with the satyric look in the sharp eyes and the compressed lips, might be seen by the wayside in the Campagna, as he stood and jested with the reapers or the vine-dressers or with the girls coming out, as they had come since the days of Horace, to draw water from the fountains of Tivoli. In more cultivated society he was apt to be nervous; for his philosophy was never proof against the terror of being laughed at. But sometimes, late at night, when the surroundings were really sympathetic, he could be very happy among his friends. 'Un salon de huit ou dix personnes,' he said, 'dont 'toutes les femmes ont eu des amants, où la conversation est 'gaie, anecdotique, et où l'on prend du punch léger à minuit 'et demie, est l'endroit du monde où je me trouve le mieux.'

In such a Paradise of Frenchmen we may leave Henri Beyle. Of him, even more than of other mortals, our judgment must be ambiguous and undecided. But of one thing at least we may be sure in his unaccommodating case. It may be difficult to strike a balance between the blemishes and the genius of his writings, between the profundities and the narrowness of his thought, between the charm and the futilities of his character; but this, at any rate, we may say of him with certainty: he was an extraordinary man.

LYTTON STRACHEY.

THE EVOLUTION OF CONTEMPORARY FRENCH LITERATURE

1. **Le Disciple** (édition définitive, 1905) ; **L'Étape** ; **Un Divorce** ; **L'Émigré** ; **Pages de critique et de doctrine** (2 vols., 1912). PAUL BOURGET. Plon-Nourrit et Cie.
2. **Un homme libre** ; **Les Déracinés** ; **L'Appel au Soldat** ; **Au service de l'Allemagne** ; **Colette Baudoche** ; **La Colline inspirée** (1913). MAURICE BARRÈS. Emile-Paul Frères.
3. **La Peur de Vivre.** A. Fontemoing. **La Croisée des chemins** ; **La Neige sur les Pas** (1911) ; **La Maison** (1913). HENRY BORDEAUX. Plon-Nourrit et Cie.
4. **Stéphanie** (1913). PAUL ADAM. Fasquelle.
5. **Le mystère de la charité de Jeanne d'Arc** (1910) ; **Le porche du mystère de la deuxième vertu** (1911) ; **Le mystère des saints innocents** (1912). CHARLES PÉGUY. Éditions des Cahiers de la Quinzaine.
6. **Le Romantisme français** (1908). PIERRE LASSERRE. Mercure de France.
7. **L'Art Poétique** ; **Théâtre** (4 vols.). Mercure de France. **Cinq grandes Odes** ; **L'Annonce faite à Marie** ; **L'Otage.** PAUL CLAUDEL. Éditions de la Nouvelle Revue Française.

A VERY great change has come over the French nation, and the nature of this change may be briefly characterised as consisting in a renascence of French energy. The virile qualities of the race, those qualities that had for many centuries made France the foremost country in Europe, appeared to have become extinct. True, the deeds of daring and heroism accomplished by Frenchmen in Africa and in Asia—deeds that built up the magnificent French empire beyond the seas—showed us that the old undaunted spirit of adventure still lived on ; but it seemed to be confined to a few individuals, choice specimens indeed, but yet merely a handful. While these heroes and adventurers (in the highest sense of the word), such as Savorgnan de Brazza, Marchand, Lenfant, were busy carving out the new empire and carrying the tricolour flag to the remotest parts of the Dark Continent, the nation as a whole was plunged in mournful lethargy, in

the lethargy of despair. It saw not the promise held out by the valiant efforts of the empire-builders, labouring in distant and unexplored regions *pour la plus grande gloire de la France.* It saw only the wounds inflicted in 1870; it saw only the anarchy that gangrened ever more and more its political and moral and intellectual life. It accepted its fate with elegant resignation, and it was content to die, if only it could do so with a smile on its lips. *Gloria victis*—the French nation was too prone to despair of itself; it did not seek to gain the victory, for it had abandoned all hope of this; it only aimed at husbanding sufficient strength to be able to die elegantly, to disappear from the world's stage after so many centuries of glory with the chivalry and heroism of the *preux* of former days. Let us show the world how to die bravely: such was the highest philosophy of a people suffering from that most insidious of all diseases, namely pessimism.

The first condition of a renascence of French energy was necessarily the rejection of pessimism and scepticism. A strong and vigorous nation is essentially optimistic; it believes in life, it believes in itself, it believes in the future of the race. We have only to think of the magnificent optimism of the Greeks, of their joyful self-confidence, of their robust belief (untainted by any sombre fanaticism) in themselves. We need only think of the optimism of the Renaissance, which was truly an epoch of giants. And Frenchmen had only to look back on their own history, had only to read the pages that tell of the building-up of the greatest of European monarchies—pages that contain the record of so much prowess, in which the glorious lust of conquest and adventure is written large, which are doubtless soiled by many crimes, but which seldom bear witness to deeds of baseness and treachery. The French were always, till the end of the eighteenth century, a nation of aristocrats; consequently they were a nation of optimists, a nation in which the joy of life and belief in life prevailed, and on which the evil bigotry of Spanish monks and Northern puritans could have no hold. Here—in their own history—the French have an inexhaustible store of optimism from which to draw. And it is pleasing to see the young generation of to-day go back to these great traditions, go back beyond the Revolution to the real sources of French

optimism and energy. For the young generation of to-day—and this is what differentiates it from the generations that have succeeded each other during the nineteenth century—is resolutely optimistic and therefore cheerful.

Such a radical transformation as that implied by the renascence of French energy which we witness to-day could not but make itself felt in the national literature. For it is in its literature that the aspirations and ideals of a nation find their highest expression. And it is very necessary that foreigners should bear in mind that a great and fundamental change is taking place in French literature at the present day. It is very necessary that foreigners should not let themselves be led astray by the glamour that enshrouds certain French writers of the older generation—that they should not, for instance, imagine that Anatole France or Pierre Loti, Maurice Maeterlinck or Edouard Rod, represent the beliefs and ideals of the France of to-day—that is to say, of the young generation born since 1875 or 1880, and which will give birth to and educate the generation of to-morrow.

The literature of the nineteenth century was characterised in part by scepticism, in part by an unreasoning belief in the omnipotence of Science, in part by a mere hankering after artistic perfection without endeavouring to express, through the work of the artist, any concrete moral or social ideal.

Common to all schools of thought, however divergent these might be, was the universal tendency to pessimism. This tendency manifested itself long before 1870; it was consequently not engendered, but only strengthened, by the disastrous war with Germany. It derived from the Revolution and the disappointments which followed in its trail, from the destruction of traditions heaped up during a dozen centuries, from the failure of the grandiose schemes of Napoleon, from the failure of the Restoration, from the failure of the July Monarchy and the Second Republic. The disaster of 1870, the loss of two fair provinces, the humiliation inflicted by the insolence of the Prussian conqueror at Versailles only served to crown an already too long record of failure and disappointment. After nearly a century of anarchy and convulsion France lay bleeding and mutilated under the heel of Prussia. How could all that was best in the French nation be anything else than pessimistic? The young

generation of to-day, which has not known the dark days of 1870 and 1871, should not judge the pessimism of its elders too severely.

It is inevitable that traces of the pessimism of an entire century should be found in the first decades of the succeeding one. The pessimistic tradition, happily abandoned by the young generation, is still kept up, in contemporary French literature, by writers of the older generation. This pessimism is especially strongly marked in the works of two authors who, among the *gens de plume* still active to-day, occupy a particularly prominent position in Europe: namely, Anatole France and Pierre Loti. The two writers in question are incontestably those who are the most widely read outside France; we may say, indeed, that by a great number of non-French students Anatole France and Pierre Loti are held to be the most highly qualified representatives of contemporary French literature.

And yet there could be no greater mistake than this. Anatole France and Pierre Loti represent the literature of a bygone age; they are the illustrious survivors of a generation whose spiritual pastors and masters were Taine and Renan, Schopenhauer and Tolstoi—of a generation of amiable sceptics and *dilettantes*, of mystical anarchists and humanitarians—of a generation suffering from a total lack of discipline, whose energies were atrophied, whose strength of will was sapped, which was gangrened by 'intellectualism' and pessimism, and which was instinctively attracted by the enervating music of Wagner with its glorification of the eminently Christian virtues of pity, humility, and chastity. Whether 'intellectualists' or 'artists,' whether materialists or professional sceptics, the writers of the nineteenth century were in substantial agreement on one point: namely that life is not worth living. For this enervated and sickly generation action was the chief evil, to be avoided at any cost. Consequently, all those doctrines that demand action as the essential condition of their existence were suppressed: patriotism, notably, was looked upon in France, during the 'nineties, as the most abject and most pitiable of superstitions. The highest wisdom was deemed to consist in believing in nothing at all, and least of all in oneself. The truly great man was he who, having made the round of all religions and

philosophical systems, considered them all with a smile of indulgent and contemptuous tolerance. Such a state of mind, eminently characteristic of the nineteenth century, finds expression in the well-known passage of Renan's 'Saint-Paul':

'Nous aimerions à rêver Paul sceptique, naufragé, abandonné, trahi par les siens, seul, atteint du désenchantement de la vieillesse. Il nous plairait que les écailles lui fussent tombées des yeux une seconde fois, et notre incrédulité douce aurait sa petite revanche si le plus dogmatique des hommes était mort triste, désespéré, disons mieux tranquille, sur quelque rivage ou quelque route de l'Espagne, en disant lui aussi: *Ergo erravi.*'

The same consciousness of the uselessness of all action, the same melancholy incredulity, we find reflected in an article of the 'Mercure de France,' which was the leading organ of the young generation of twenty years ago, and in one of the early numbers of which (1892) we read:

'Aucune époque, semble-t-il, ne fut plus propice que la nôtre à se croiser les bras et à attendre. Nous sommes du monde qui s'en va et il est séant de s'en aller avec lui . . . La seule chose convenable est donc plus que jamais de remonter dans les tours d'ivoire, pendant qu'elles sont encore debout—ce n'est pas pour longtemps—et d'y rêver soit aux choses éternelles, soit aux difficultés de la grammaire.'

This is just what we find in Anatole France, who is unquestionably the most perfectly typical representative of that disheartened, sceptical, and pessimistic generation. Take up any of his books, whether it be 'Les Opinions de M. Jérôme 'Coignard,' or the four volumes of the 'Histoire contemporaine,' or 'Le Jardin d'Épicure,' or 'L'Île des Pingouins,' or 'Les 'Dieux ont soif,' and we find the same sardonic smile, the same bitter irony, the same total disbelief in all noble and disinterested motives as incentives to action, the same unrelieved pessimism. For Anatole France the idea of justice is a fiction—a convenient fiction wherewith to cloak deeds of aggression, rapine, and plunder. Thus has it always been, and thus will it always remain. Religions, empires, nations, languages, works of art and discoveries of science, codes of law and political systems—all these products of human development and activity come and go, they maintain themselves for a time and then vanish without leaving any permanent trace, without modifying in the smallest degree the inherently

depraved moral nature of mankind. And the highest wisdom of which humanity is capable is attained by the complete sceptic, who observes, with a smile of condescending and contemptuous pity, the circular movement that vulgar and untrained minds take to be progress towards a definite end.

Anatole France and Pierre Loti, Maurice Maeterlinck and Georges Rodenbach, Edouard Rod: these are, together with Maupassant and Zola, the leading representatives of what we may term surviving French pessimism. True, premature death has carried away four of these long before their time was due; and the loss to French literature has been immense. For who can tell if Maupassant, who died at forty-three, or Rodenbach, who left us at forty-one, would not have changed—would not, in the course of years, have come to recognise that life after all is worth living, even if it be only for the sake of the memory of one sweet moment never to recur? Other contemporary writers, and among the greatest, have changed; such has been the lot of Bourget, and Huysmans, and Barrès, and Paul Adam, to mention only these. There is no disgrace in making from time to time one's *mea culpa*.

It was not mere artistic dilettantism that caused Georges Rodenbach to take Bruges-la-Morte as the subject of his books. The unique city of the dead, whose fascinating charm he sang, is not only the *divine enchanteresse* of artists and poets; it contains also, amidst its ruins and treasures, an infallible antidote to all will-power and energy. The *personnages* of Rodenbach's books—Hugues Viane in 'Bruges-la-Morte,' Joris Borluut in 'Le Carillonneur'—show us only too well the effect produced by Bruges, with its atmosphere of silence and death, on the will-power of those who fall in love with this city of the dead. All life has fled from Bruges, and the atmosphere of the city, heavy-laden with sadness and mystery, is also heavy-laden with poison—with poison subtle and insidious, that acts like opium on all those who, loving life, yet fall under the magic spell of the Northern Necropolis. But it is precisely for this reason that Rodenbach loves Bruges, for this reason that he sings her beauties and charms; he celebrates her as the great killer of life and energy, he recommends her as such to all those who, disgusted with life and weary of all effort, desire to suppress life elegantly and painlessly. To such as these—and they were numerous at the end of the nineteenth century—Roden-

bach indicated an artistic Nirvana, where, far removed from the rattle and roar of busy streets, they could stifle within themselves all desire of a worthless existence. A living tomb, from which one may listen to the knell of muffled bells reverberating gloomily through deserted streets and o'er silent canals: such was the ideal of Rodenbach, the pessimistic and disenchanted lover of Bruges-la-Morte. And it was an ideal well calculated to appeal to a society worm-eaten by pessimism.

If the doctrine of fatalism enjoyed considerable favour up till quite recently, this was due to the influence of a whole school of literature. Schopenhauer, Ibsen, Wagner, Dostoiewski, Renan, Loti, Maeterlinck, Rodenbach, Desjardins, Rod: all these have been, in varying degrees, influential in spreading and popularising the idea. The philosophy of Maeterlinck has been described as 'une 'philosophie sans larmes, sans angoisse, et sans effort,'* but it may perhaps be more correctly defined as *un fatalisme sans Dieu*. The mystery of life finds expression in the obscure symbolism, which appealed to the public because the latter could not understand it, of 'Pelléas et Mélisande' and 'Monna Vanna,' where we see, darkly and as through a veil, the impenetrable Fate that presides over our destinies lying in wait in order to destroy human happiness and frustrate human hopes. The vagueness of the notion of Fate is such as to favour the development of a mystical and sometimes wholly unintelligible symbolism, which impresses the reader by its very strangeness, but which is incapable of providing any durable satisfaction. It is not surprising that Maeterlinck should be competely out of touch with the young French generation of to-day, which loves action and concrete realisations, which demands persistently a rule of life, and which finds a practical and intelligible rule of life in the discipline of the Catholic Church. The nebulous mysticism of the author of 'La Sagesse et la Destinée' cannot content an active generation, which has a profound antipathy for scepticism and dilettantism and intellectualism, and whose idealism is of an eminently practical nature.

---

* L. Dumont-Wilden, 'Maurice Maeterlinck,' in La Nouvelle Revue Française, September 1, 1912.

Another writer whose influence on the older generation—on the generation that monopolised the universities and the world of letters in the 'nineties—was very considerable, and who has likewise been left stranded on the rocks by the receding tide, is Edouard Rod. It would, however, be the blackest ingratitude on the part of the 'youngsters' of to-day were they to forget the great and lasting services rendered to the cause of the reawakening of the historic faith of the French nation by the author of 'Le Sens de la Vie.' Rod was one of those who most powerfully contributed to the downfall of that narrow materialism which reigned supreme in France from about 1850 on. 'Le Sens de la Vie' is one of those books which, with Melchior de Vogüé's 'Roman russe' and Paul Bourget's 'Disciple,' mark a turning-point in the history of contemporary French thought. The influence of all these books was deep and lasting; the two first mentioned gave an immense impetus to the reaction against the monstrous pretensions of a certain school of philosophy, which aimed at imprisoning the entire spiritual life of civilised mankind in a scientific strait-jacket; M. Bourget's 'Disciple' was a crushing blow aimed at the 'intellectualism' which destroys all will-power by sapping all energy, and which transforms the individual into a mere thinking machine. In an age of universal scepticism, in which an aggressive atheism represented the last word of truth for the vast majority of the 'intellectual' youth' of France, and in which irreligion had attained a far greater triumph than at any previous period in history (not even excepting the eighteenth century)—in an age such as this, Rod had the courage to admit that he knelt before the crucifix and made the sign of the cross. And in all his books Rod never ceased to be the eloquent preacher of an essentially religious idealism, that was a welcome relief to a great number after the pretentious and dogmatic materialism of the nineteenth century. To a certain extent, then, Rod may claim, despite his pessimism, to be a precursor of the renascence that we witness to-day of the great historic traditions, religious and moral, of the nation.

Yet is it not difficult to see that Rod's work is essentially in the nature of a boundary-stone between two generations. If some of his tendencies undoubtedly herald the advent of a new generation and of a new order of things, he also manifests

other tendencies that recall only too frequently the vanishing era and notably one of the worst features of the latter, its pessimism. For the work of Rod is deeply tainted with pessimism. He delights in placing us in front of inextricable situations, and especially does he take a mournful pleasure in depicting to us the cruel vanity of that noblest of human passions—Love. It is here, in the sombre pictures which he draws of life's impenetrable mystery, that his talent shows itself at its best. In this respect he resembles Pierre Loti. The latter is a consummate artist, yet it is not in the richly-coloured pictures of India and Haiti, of Brittany and the Basque country, of Japan and Senegal, that his artistic power reveals itself, but in the simple and effective exposition of the tragedy of human lives. Thus it is also with Rod. The situations in front of which Loti and Rod place us are never dramatic in the popular sense of the word, they are never extraordinary; the *personnages* of the authors are not Supermen or Super-women, but men and women like those we meet in every-day life, with the same weaknesses and foibles, the same passions and ambitions, capable of the same courage and self-denial in difficult circumstances. And it is this quality which renders Loti and Rod so popular—we understand the hopes and joys, the sufferings and tears, of their very *human* personages, living under conditions that are the lot of the vast majority of us. The reproach which the critic can level against them is not that of having misrepresented the reality of facts, but rather that they have given us a one-sided and consequently misleading view of reality.

The *leitmotiv* of both these writers is the incompatibility of Life and Happiness. It is perilous for us to raise the cup of happiness to our lips, for there is a fatality attaching to this cup, and that fatality will pursue us without ceasing during our whole existence. Even as the *philtre d'amour* in the Breton legend of Tristan and Isolde forces the lovers to fall into each other's arms, although they clearly perceive the tragic *dénouement* that must inevitably be the outcome of such a situation, so must we also, once we have tasted of the cup of happiness—of that real and unique joy that never comes again—pursue during the rest of our life a phantom that always haunts us, and that we can never grasp.

In conformity with this pessimistic view of life, Loti and

Rod have taken pleasure in showing us everywhere suffering as the direct and inevitable consequence of happiness—as if the latter were a crime, to be expiated by untold moral agony or even death. And such indeed is happiness represented by these authors to be: according to them, happiness is in the nature of a crime of *lèse-destin*, of a crime against that mysterious and omnipotent *Fatum* that presides over the destinies of every mortal; for this deity is a jealous and exacting tyrant, who grudges man every instant of happiness, and who punishes sternly and unsparingly those who are unfortunate enough to excite his wrath by their joy and mirth. And the tragedy of life appears the more sombre and meaningless, seeing that the higher natures among mankind, those who are born to suffer, are impelled by the laws of human nature to the very actions that must needs produce nothing but disappointment and misery. We are impelled by the laws of human nature to love, and love is the most fertile source of human suffering ever invented by the maleficent genius of the *Fatum*. Such is the lesson taught in 'Les Roches Blanches,' in 'Dernier 'Refuge,' in 'Le Silence,' three of the most powerful and most deeply impressive of Edouard Rod's books; and such, also, is the lesson conveyed by 'Le Roman d'un Spahi,' by 'Pêcheur d'Islande,' by 'Les Désenchantées,' by 'Le Livre 'de la Pitié et de la Mort.'

A great change has taken place in French literature within the last seven or eight years. The sombre pessimism of the older generation has been shaken off. Anatole France, Pierre Loti, Maeterlinck, stand to-day isolated, out of all touch or sympathy with the 'youngsters.' M. Octave Mirbeau's 'Dingo,' with its pessimism, its hatred of all order and tradition, its glorification of anarchy and the most extreme forms of individualism, appeared like an anomaly in May 1913; it should have been published ten years previously. Such a book is incomprehensible to the young generation of to-day; but it would have delighted the pessimistic sentimentalists and sceptics, the morbid 'intellectualists' and self-advertising anarchists who ruled the literary world at the beginning of the century. If anyone desire to measure the difference between the French generation of yesterday and that of to-day, let him read first M. Octave Mirbeau's 'Dingo,' in which

the characteristics of the older generation find their clearest and crudest expression ; and let him then peruse ' La Colline ' inspirée ' by M. Maurice Barrès, or ' La Maison ' by M. Henry Bordeaux, or ' Stéphanie ' by M. Paul Adam. It is more than a mere difference ; it is the contrast between two separate worlds that we perceive.

This evolution of contemporary French literature, which responds to a reawakening of patriotic feeling, to a renascence of virility and energy, in the youth of the nation—and more especially in the *jeunesse intellectuelle*—has been prepared by writers of the older generation capable of emancipating themselves from the unhealthy influence of their environment. Chief among these are the five ' B's,' as we may call them : MM. Brunetière, Bourget, Barrès, Bordeaux, Bergson.* It would be difficult to overstate the influence exerted by these writers in preparing the renascence that we witness to-day. M. Brunetière, in his critical essays on the history of French literature, which showed in him the greatest critic of his day, and which did so much to bring the *jeunesse intellectuelle* back to a deeper and juster view of the greatest century in French history—namely the seventeenth ; in his ' Discours ' de Combat,' which fought in difficult times the good fight for patriotism, which kindled anew the flame of pride in the national traditions, and paved the way for a recognition of the legitimacy of religious belief ; in his ' Sur les Chemins ' de la Croyance,' in which he skilfully appealed to Auguste Comte against the judgment of modern philosophers who condemn Christianity in the name of science : in all these works, as also in the ' Revue des Deux Mondes,' which he so ably edited for many years, M. Brunetière sought to combat the superstitions of the day, to bring the thinking public in France back to saner conceptions of national duty, to expose the hollowness and fallacies of all those theories—Anarchism, Socialism, Pacificism, Humanitarianism, Individualism—that proceed from the same poisoned source of pessimism. He was a fighter who feared not hard blows and who knew how to deal them. His services to the country and to the Church were not less great than his services to literature and literary

* We should most certainly add to these the names of MM. Charles Maurras and Pierre Lasserre.

history—and how great these were, can be measured by the fact that no one has been found capable of replacing Brunetière as historian and critic. Among those who have prepared the way for a *relèvement national*, a place of honour must be assigned to him whom death carried off so prematurely.

We have already said that the publication of M. Paul Bourget's 'Disciple' in 1889 marked an important date in the history of French thought. It is from this time on that the reaction against the 'intellectualism' of the nineteenth century may be said to date. The nineteenth century, since 1850 or thereabouts, had been completely under the domination of science, the discoveries of which had revolutionised our every-day life and all our philosophical conceptions of the world. Especially great was the influence of that least satisfactory of all the sciences, namely physiological psychology, which was expected to furnish us with a solution of the fundamental problem of thought. The man of science was commonly believed to be in possession of the means whereby the riddle of the universe might be explained, and the whole future of humanity shaped. All the great writers of the latter half of the nineteenth century were under the irresistible spell of this prestige of science—all sought to utilise as much as possible the facts and theories of science, and to make of the novel an instrument of scientific observation and discussion. We need only remember Balzac, who was truly a *docteur-ès-sciences sociales*, as he called himself; and alongside of Balzac we may name Flaubert, de Goncourt, Zola, Baudelaire, Dumas junior, Leconte de Lisle. It was an age of rigid positivism, of which the teachers in matters philosophical were Comte, Taine, Renan, Claude Bernard, Théodule Ribot, Berthelot. Typical products of this age are Adrien Sixte and Robert Greslou, in M. Paul Bourget's 'Disciple.'

Adrien Sixte is the sincere 'intellectualist,' the typical thinking-machine, whose entire existence is a mental one, who ignores everything of life, and knows only what he has read in books. Robert Greslou is a degenerate type of humanity, a victim of 'intellectualism' also, but on whose diseased mind the doctrines of scientific determinism have produced a dire effect. Such a type as Robert Greslou would probably be incomprehensible to English or American readers, for neither the English nor the Americans can count 'intel-

'lectualism' among their many faults and failings. No one will ever be tempted to suspect either John Bull or Uncle Sam of thinking too much! But Robert Greslou was a very real type to Frenchmen of the generation born before 1875—to a generation gangrened by this terrible and insidious disease of 'intellectualism.' Of this disease, the hero of M. Paul Bourget manifests all the symptoms. His energy, his will-power, in a word his whole life, have been sacrificed to the *Idea* in the Hegelian sense of the word; this 'intellectualism' produces as a natural consequence a morbid desire of self-analysis; and the desire of self-analysis becomes, in its turn, a desire of psychological experiments that shall satisfy not only a morbid 'intellectual' curiosity, but also irresistible sensual cravings. All these results of 'intellectualism,' of an education that takes no thought either of the soul or of the body, but concentrates itself exclusively on that which is most superficial in human life, have been excellently noted by M. Paul Bourget in his epoch-making book, dedicated to the youth of France. And the appeal of the author to this youth has been heard, although many years were destined to pass before the seed sown bore fruit.

In his subsequent books M. Paul Bourget has continued to teach the lesson contained in 'Le Disciple,' and to develop it. All these books are not of equal value. 'L'Étape' is excellent; 'L'Émigré' is a pathetic study of a social class unfortunately now extinct in France; 'Un Divorce' adds nothing to the author's reputation. But in his 'Pages de critique et de doctrine,' published in 1912, M. Bourget can point with legitimate pride to the change that has taken place in the mind of the *jeunesse intellectuelle* since the day when Taine wrote to him, twenty-three years previously: '*Ma génération est finie.*' With legitimate pride he can point to this change, for he has been one of those who have been instrumental in bringing it about.

Taine's perspicacity did not fail him when he wrote the above-quoted words, penned on the occasion of the publication of 'Le Disciple.' 'Oui, vraiment,' said M. Henri Bergson in an interview published by the 'Gaulois' (June 15, 1912),

'je crois à une sorte de renaissance morale française, et ce qui me frappe le plus, ce qui me fait bien augurer de cette renaissance, c'est qu'elle n'est pas seulement une transformation des idées,

mais une vraie transformation ou plutôt une vraie création de la volonté. Or, la volonté, c'est l'expression même du tempérament, c'est-à-dire de ce qu'il est le plus difficile de modifier.'

M. Bergson himself, the sworn enemy of the pseudo-scientific determinism of the 'intellectualist' school, the champion of the ideas of liberty and responsibility, is one of those who have most greatly influenced the thought of the new generation in France. 'L'Évolution créatrice' has given this generation, weary and sick of the pessimistic determinism of its elders, a philosophy of action and cheerful affirmation. M. Bergson has resolved the antithesis between thought and action that had been the stumbling-block of the 'intellectualist' and materialist philosophy during fifty years.

M. Maurice Barrès is another of the 'elders' who have educated the young generation of to-day. In the works of no other writer is the evolution from extreme individualism to a sane conception of the necessity of social discipline and order so noticeable as in his. One need only compare 'L'Ennemi des Lois' with 'La Colline inspirée.' M. Barrès has contributed, more than any other writer, to that renascence of patriotism and of the consciousness of the superiority of French over German culture which we witness to-day. 'Au service de l'Allemagne' and 'Colette Baudoche' are books that have brought home to Frenchmen the fact that the rivalry between France and Germany is not only the result of political combinations or economic competition, but that it masks a struggle between two races, between two civilisations, between two wholly different conceptions of the world and of life. M. Barrès has also brought home to Frenchmen the fact that patriotism is not the artificial sentiment, the mere 'historical category,' which learned professors and revolutionary demagogues have falsely represented it to be; he has shown that patriotism is an 'organic' sentiment having its roots in the deepest depths of human nature, that it is an instinct as natural to man as the instinct which causes the child to love its mother, and *vice versa*. M. Barrès has shown that patriotism means the instinctive love of a man for his native soil, for the soil that has nurtured him, to which he is attached by all the roots that have in the course of successive generations attached his forefathers to the same soil. It may sound strange to English readers, this earnest and vigorous

lesson of patriotism ; for the English are accustomed to regard patriotism as something so natural as not to need any justification. Unfortunately this has not been the case in France, where patriotism, especially in intellectual circles, was for a considerable time greatly on the wane. A typical product of the ' scientific ' generation of the latter half of the nineteenth century is Bouteiller, the Kantian Universalist and citizen of Europe, in ' Les Déracinés.' M. Barrès has seized this opportunity of attacking Kant and the notion of universalism which constitutes the basis of the Königsbergian philosophy. There is an artificial element in Kant's doctrine, due to the fact that the latter proceeds from an abstract individual *per se* as starting-point, whereas such a universal type of humanity is non-existent. Kant supposed the individual reason to be independent of the various conditions of heredity and environment that preside over the destinies of each one of us. He supposed the existence of an individual detached from all the limitations placed by race, by nationality, by education, on the evolution of his personality. He supposed the individual to be governed by reason, by that one element of mental life that is everywhere identical, and not by instinct. M. Barrès has shown us, by the example of Bouteiller, how pernicious the influence of such a doctrine can be, for it tends to make the individual neglect precisely those factors of his existence which are alone of value for the formation of his personality, and, consequently, for the normal development of his activity. Racadot and Mouchefrin, in ' Les Déracinés,' are victims of this doctrine. They are victims who succumb, who are vanquished in the struggle for life. Julien Dartot, in M. Edouard Estaunié's ' Le Ferment,' is a *déraciné victorieux*. Bereft of all moral principles, as a result of his having been uprooted from his natural environment, he sets himself the task of demoralising society. The result for society is in both cases the same. In both cases French society loses the co-operation of members who, had they been properly trained and disciplined, would have constituted a social force in the best sense of the word. French society is the loser in the game, even though she may cut off the head of a Racadot. Despite the avenging guillotine, it is French society which has been vanquished by the system of education organised by this society. Professor Bouteiller has impoverished the State

which enables him to live, to enrich himself, and to satisfy his political ambitions.

If intellectual circles in France, and especially the *jeunesse intellectuelle*, have to-day recovered their patriotism, this is due in a very large measure to M. Maurice Barrès and to his untiring propaganda. Precisely because he writes for Frenchmen and only for Frenchmen, M. Barrès is less appreciated outside France than certain other writers—notably Anatole France, Pierre Loti, and Maurice Maeterlinck. 'Étant 'Lorrain et Français, je juge toutes choses du point de vue 'français,' he wrote in the preface to 'Au service de l'Allemagne'; a Bouteiller or an Adrien Sixte would have written: 'Étant 'un homme, je juge toutes choses du point de vue humain.' In his own country, among the youth of that country, the influence of M. Barrès has been great; and this is a healthy symptom, for it shows that the young Frenchmen of to-day are no longer sceptical and pessimistic, but practical, and consequently patriotic.

M. Barrès has been instrumental in destroying the legend of the 'intellectual' superiority of the Germans. Two causes of a very different nature had contributed to establishing this legend: Mme. de Staël's 'De l'Allemagne' and the war of 1870–1. At the end of the nineteenth century, M. Barrès commenced a campaign having an object diametrically opposed to that of Mme. de Staël's campaign at the beginning of the century. Whereas Mme. de Staël appealed to the idealism of the great German thinkers as against the materialism of the First Empire, M. Barrès takes pleasure in contrasting French idealism with the narrow materialism of contemporary Germany. Both are right, for the conditions have wholly changed since the days of Mme. de Staël. The change has not been favourable to German culture, which has lost, since the influence of an aggressive militarism and of pedantic professors has been substituted for that of the great masters of idealism, all those qualities that rendered it so admirable in former times. The Germany of the Herr Lieutenant and the Herr Professor is not the Germany of Lessing and Wieland, of Goethe and Schiller. And it is consequently an excellent thing that M. Barrès should have destroyed the absurd legend of German intellectual superiority. In order to maintain her position in the world, it is not necessary that France should

borrow the bureaucratic and pedantic discipline of Germany. It suffices that she return to her own great traditions, to those of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—that French youth be formed in the school of Ronsard and Montaigne, of Corneille and Racine, of Bossuet and Pascal, and that it shake off the evil influence of Rousseau and the Encyclopedists, of the pessimists and intellectualists of the nineteenth century.

At a time when the stability of marriage life is greatly weakened among certain sections of the *bourgeoisie*, to say nothing of the working classes, it is refreshing to read books like those of M. Henry Bordeaux. It is sincerely to be hoped that two of his books especially, ' La Croisée des chemins ' and ' La Maison,' will not only find a large circle of readers—for of this the books of M. Bordeaux are always assured—but that they will carry home effectually to such readers the truth of the lesson which the author seeks to teach. French readers will learn the danger and hollowness of certain modern ideas that can be traced back to the eighteenth century and to the Romantics—of those ideas of which the doctrine of individualism is the synthesis, and which so greatly overestimate the value and importance of individual emancipation. Foreign readers will learn to appreciate better the virtues of the French family, which generally remains concealed from the view of outsiders because it is the most strictly exclusive of organisations. There is reason to be grateful to M. Henry Bordeaux for having shown us French family life as it really is, the French home in the best acceptation of the word. For there are hundreds of thousands of such homes in France; they are not all of them castles or country houses or mansions; many consist of nothing more than a room, and this room is frequently small. And yet they are all the same, for they all of them bear witness to the same virtues of discipline, courage, self-denial, attachment to high ideals—in all we find the same solidarity, the same devotion to a common cause. There are many fathers like unto the one whose portrait M. Bordeaux has so finely drawn in ' La Maison,' defenders of the hearth, guardians of the family traditions, faithful custodians of the moral patrimony bequeathed to them by their ancestors, and which they in turn will bequeath undiminished to their descendants. There are many French mothers like unto Mme. Rambert, mothers who may

truly be described as *les anges gardiens du foyer*, wives who are the right hand of their husbands, mothers who with equal zeal and care watch over the interests of the household, and survey jealously and lovingly the education of the children. The French family has found in M. Bordeaux a worthy champion. And it is fortunate that a writer of the first rank should have arisen who bestows not his attention on the frivolities and vanities of Parisian life, who is content to ignore the cosmopolitan capital of France, and who shows us instead an aspect of life in the provinces—the life of the family, which can be preserved and adequately safeguarded only on condition that it remain in a healthy environment. The danger of transplanting individuals and families has been shown us by M. Paul Bourget in ' l'Étape,' by M. Maurice Barrès in ' Les Déracinés,' by M. Edouard Estaunié in ' Le ' Ferment.' M. Bordeaux has shown us all the strength that a family, and each of its component individuals, can draw from the soil to which several generations of ancestors have been attached. He has followed, with excellent results, in the footsteps of M. Maurice Barrès.

We are particularly grateful to M. Bordeaux, not only for his admirable studies of French family life, but also for having rehabilitated France in general—for having cleansed her from the unmerited stigma of immorality and viciousness that attached to her during the latter part of the nineteenth century. Frenchmen have never counted hypocrisy among their faults ; they have never pretended to be better than they really are. All such puritanical manifestations of excellence they have been content to leave to the Anglo-Saxon and Teutonic peoples. The latter, not having the sense of humour, have not been able to avoid making themselves supremely ridiculous as well as supremely odious. We cannot imagine the French, whose native humour is proverbial and who know what good taste is, becoming impudently and outrageously virtuous like the unmannerly Northerners. And these Northerners, fastening on to certain French literary productions, have not neglected to point the finger, with unctuous self-satisfaction, at ' degenerate ' France,' where morality is at such a shockingly low ebb. And the same Pharisees were not less glad to seize the opportunity, whenever it presented itself, of going over to

the 'modern Babylon' themselves, in order to make a practical study of the pleasures and vices to be found there.

That there is a very considerable amount of vice in Paris; that the stability of the marriage-tie has been gravely impaired in France by the facilities afforded for divorce; that certain circles of the aristocracy and *grande bourgeoisie* are exceedingly corrupt: all this is undoubtedly true, and no Frenchman has ever attempted to deny it. But it may confidently be asserted that matters are certainly not one iota worse in France than they are in any other country. If the absurd legend of French degeneracy, of *la pourriture française*, has been formed in Europe, this must be ascribed in the first place to the influence of French literature, and notably of the so-called 'realistic' literature. If the European reader, judging the French peasant according to 'Les Paysans' or 'La Terre,' French family life according to 'Madame Bovary,' Parisian working-men according to 'l'Assommoir,' French civilisation in general according to 'Nana' or 'La Bête humaine,' imagines France to be travelling fast along the high-road to perdition, he can scarcely be blamed for this. In his 'Pages de critique et de doctrine' M. Bourget has very justly observed that a novel 'n'est pas de la vie *représentée*, mais de la vie '*racontée*.' The majority of readers are apt to forget this obvious truth, and to imagine that the novel is a sort of photographic film on which the outer world is objectively reproduced. True, the naturalistic school claimed to be thus strictly objective; but its claim must be rejected as null and void. No writer can divest himself of his personality, and this personality gives each work its characteristic *empreinte*. The world described by the novelist is not the world as it is, but the world as the novelist sees it. No writers were more 'personal' than the professed 'realists' such as Balzac, Flaubert, de Goncourt, Zola, Maupassant, Huysmans; and we must further bear in mind that all those novelists who aim at transforming the novel into a sociological study—as is the case with the vast majority of French novelists during the last fifty years—tend to what are frequently wholly unjustifiable generalisations. The writer studies a particular case, a particular individual, or a particular family, and proceeds forthwith to apply the *data* derived by him from his study to the generality of individuals or the generality

of families. This tendency to excessive generalisation was especially marked in the writings of the Naturalist school. Flaubert claimed for 'Madame Bovary' that it was a study of provincial morals: *mœurs de province* was the sub-title given by him to the work; and Zola went so far as to claim that the Rougon-Macquart novels adequately describe the conditions of family life in France during the Second Empire.

M. Henry Bordeaux has done well in showing those who know France only through the medium of her literature that the descriptions of French life revelled in by the Naturalist school are, to say the least, absurdly exaggerated. The portrait of family life in France which he has traced for us is a true one, and bears the stamp of truth on the face of it. M. Bordeaux is one of those novelists who not only interest but instruct. One feels better for reading books such as 'La Neige sur les Pas' and 'La Maison.' And one feels that the *maison* which he so well describes, and which is the school of discipline and authority, of solidarity and self-sacrifice—that the *maison* is the reproduction in miniature of the French Fatherland. The latter also needs a tradition to maintain its strength and influence in the world's counsels; it also needs discipline and authority, solidarity and self-sacrifice, now more than ever; it also needs far-seeing chiefs, capable of spontaneous and energetic action, and capable of transmitting intact to the future the legacy bequeathed by the past; it also needs defence against the enemies that menace it not only from outside but also from within—against the dangerous and venomous foes of anti-patriotism and revolutionary syndicalism. There is no contemporary writer more characteristically French, more conscious of the needs of his country at the present time, than M. Bordeaux.

The notion of family solidarity, and that of individual responsibility which is its corollary, have recently found another champion in M. Paul Adam. Sign of the times; for M. Paul Adam's views were not always conservative! In 'Stéphanie' we find the author of 'Le Mystère des Foules,' of 'La Force,' of 'Le Trust,' violently protesting against Molière and George Sand, whom he accuses of undoing all the work accomplished by Roman and French jurisconsults with a view to assuring the moral and material welfare of the family. M. Paul Adam does not regard love, or any other sort of 'frivolous senti-

'mentalism,' as an adequate basis for marriage; the latter is a social institution, existing exclusively for the benefit of society and of the race, and in which the likes and dislikes of the individual count for nothing. The *mariage de raison*, which is also the *mariage d'argent*, is infinitely preferable to the *mariage d'amour*, for the former takes account of the interests of the children, which it does not leave exposed to the changes and chances of the future. The young girl must not marry, for love, a penniless youth, for the children will not receive their due, seeing that a good education is an expensive matter. The bachelor of fifty must not marry and thereby frustrate the legitimate hopes of his nephews and nieces. M. Paul Adam expounds his doctrine by the mouth of Huvelin, the millionaire banker, who seeks to persuade his brother-in-law of forty-seven not to marry, not to destroy the fond hopes of a sister who has been guilty of marrying for love only, and who is reduced to a state of economic misery in consequence:

'A la naissance, nous recevons de nos parents la vie, de nos ancêtres les facultés spirituelles, de notre race les avantages qui assure une civilisation historique, de notre patrie la sécurité nécessaire à notre développement selon les mœurs et les tendances de la nation. Nous nous trouvons débiteurs de tout cela. Nous sommes les dépositaires de ces forces confiées à notre gérance viagère par l'ensemble des siècles et des hommes. Il faudra rendre, un jour, ce dépôt sous une forme quelconque. C'est une loi économique. Elle régit toute circulation fiduciaire de valeurs. Et la morale, en effet, oblige les mères de sacrifier leurs luxes ou leurs plaisirs à l'éducation de leur progéniture. Ainsi le présent de l'individu est subordonné à l'avenir de la société. Cet avenir, ce sont les enfants. Notre génération leur passe la gérance des forces héréditaires. . . . C'est l'Avenir qui nous somme de payer la dette contractée par nous envers le Passé.'

Our responsibility towards the future, by means of which we pay our debt to the past, obliges us to place our immediate descendants in an economic position that will enable them to develop their moral patrimony without let or hindrance. M. Paul Adam has written a highly interesting and suggestive book, and one which is very characteristic of the views and tendencies of the young French generation of to-day; for this young generation loves order and discipline and authority, and it is profoundly conscious of its responsibility towards

the nation, whose destinies are confided to its care. Individualism is a fruit of pessimism; weary of strife and disgusted with Reality, the individual seeks refuge from a world to which he cannot adapt himself in the 'ivory tower' of the Ego. The young generation, not being pessimistic, does not tend to individualism. The true meaning and purport of marriage, as an institution for safeguarding the interests of the race, has been grasped by this young generation.

The latter, as a whole, is sincerely Catholic—we speak of the 'intellectual youth.' But its Catholicism is itself the consequence of its love of order and discipline, of its imperious need of action. With an entire group, that of the *Action française*, the adhesion of the members to Catholicism is based to a large extent on the ideas, developed by M. Paul Adam in 'Stéphanie,' of the debt owed by the individual to the Past, and which he must repay to the Future. It is because Catholicism is the historic form of religion in France, because Catholicism has shaped and moulded French society in the past, that the great Catholic patrimony of France must be handed down intact to posterity. The discipline of the Church is the discipline adapted to the needs of French society, and it is therefore the duty of the present generation, trustee of a legacy bequeathed by the Past for transmission to the Future, not to destroy the inherited traditions indispensable to the cohesion and survival of the nation. The present generation must render account to the future of a Catholic patrimony accumulated during fourteen centuries.

The *Action française* does not, however, by any means represent only what we may call 'political Catholicism.' A large number—perhaps the majority—of its members are sincere believers who fulfil regularly their religious obligations. These also have been brought back into the fold, which many had left, by their love of order and their need of action. They required *un dogmatisme précurseur de l'action*, a dogma which gives us certainties instead of possibilities, and which affords therefore a sound basis for action—for all action must be founded on belief. Prompt decision and vigorous action require belief, firm and unquestioning—and not reasoning, which paralyses both. The new generation in France tarried not in making this discovery, and it found the beliefs it needed in Catholicism;

that is to say, it simply went back to the beliefs of its ancestors, to those beliefs that had been the foundation of *their* activity during fourteen centuries, and that constituted, in consequence, the foundation of the greatness of the French nation.

This *retour aux croyances ancestrales* did not require any herculean mental efforts. On the contrary, it was the return to a natural environment in which French minds find the stores of nourishment accumulated for them during fourteen centuries. Faith comes easily to these young *intellectuels*. It is not their intelligence which seeks to grasp the impenetrable mystery of dogma—as is generally the case with Protestant converts—but it is their whole being which seeks an adequate discipline and a sufficient outlet for the energy stored up within it. They do not go in for theological hair-splitting or for learned apologetical dissertations. Their belief is simple, to some it may appear almost childlike. But its very simplicity constitutes its strength, for it is not reasoning that fortifies belief.

This belief has been sung by M. Charles Péguy in poems which have placed him in the front rank of contemporary French artists, in ' Le mystère de la charité de Jeanne d'Arc ' and in ' Le mystère des saints innocents.' It has been sung likewise by other poets, by M. Paul Claudel in ' Cinq Grandes ' Odes ' and in ' L'Annonce faite à Marie,' and by M. Francis Jammes in ' Les Géorgiques chrétiennes.' The Catholicism of this trilogy of poets has nothing sombre or forbidding about it ; it is a ' sweet and reasonable ' religion, that confounds itself to a large extent with patriotism. The love and mercy and Fatherhood of God is the *leitmotiv* of M. Péguy's poems in blank verse, that reveal in every line the personality of the author. Some devout persons—of the type of those whom the very Catholic J. K. Huysmans contemptuously called *bondieusards* and *pieusards*—may even be shocked at the exceedingly human manner in which M. Péguy causes God to speak :

' Celui qui a dit le soir son *Notre Père* peut dormir
tranquille.
Croyez-vous que je vais m'amuser à faire des misères à
ces pauvres enfants ?
Suis-je pas leur père ? . . .
Est-ce que je leur fais la guerre ?
Oui je leur fais la guerre, mais on sait bien pourquoi.

C'est pour les empêcher de perdre la bataille.
Je suis un honnête homme, dit Dieu . . .
Croyez-vous que j'aie quelque goût à les prendre en défaut ?
Et que ça m'amuse, de condamner ?
Pauvres gens. Je vous le demande.
Suis-je donc un bourreau d'Orient ? . . .
Non, non, bonnes gens, mangez votre soupe et dormez.'

Let there be no mistake about it. This sort of language is exactly adapted to the needs of the present day in France, where the tide of Catholicism is rising surely and rapidly, but where the habitual language of theologians would not be understood. Since the days of Rabelais, who emptied the vials of his irony on the religious orders—*moines moinant de moinerie*—there has never been any enthusiasm in France for either monks or theologians. It is not the theological disputations of Bossuet with the Protestants or with Fénelon that appeal to the French mind, but his wonderfully persuasive eloquence, his extraordinary learning, his clearness and unrivalled power of exposition. Neither St. Thomas Aquinas nor St. Charles Borromæus, neither Chateaubriand nor Joseph de Maistre, would convert young Frenchmen of to-day ; neither dogmatic expositions, nor works of art, nor treatises of moral and social philosophy, are what the latter need. Far more attractive for them is the poet speaking *le langage du cœur et des sentiments*, and preaching the Fatherhood of God in the simple tongue of ordinary mortals. But M. Péguy has not only aimed at kindling anew the flame of religious belief, he has also wished to rekindle the flame of patriotism, and to reawaken hope and confidence in the future of France.

God is represented by M. Péguy as being in a quite special manner the protector and ally of the French. Thus do the words *croyance* and *patrie* become synonymous. Very skilfully does M. Péguy appeal to the strong patriotic feeling of the young generation—which he himself, by means of the ' Cahiers ' de la Quinzaine,' has been instrumental in developing—and show what indissoluble links unite the idea of God to the idea of the Fatherland. The idea is in itself anything but new—every tribe and every nation has concretised its Will of Power in the notion of a tribal or national deity—but the way in which M. Péguy presents it is original :

'C'est embêtant, dit Dieu. Quand il n'y aura plus ces Français,
Il y a des choses que je fais, il n'y aura plus personne pour les comprendre. . . .
O peuple inventeur de la cathédrale, je ne t'ai point trouvé léger en foi.
O peuple inventeur de la croisade, je ne t'ai point trouvé léger en charité.
Quant à l'espérance, il vaut mieux ne pas en parler, il n'y en a que pour eux.'

The influence of M. Péguy on the *jeunesse intellectuelle* has been great. And the young man whose mind has been formed by M. Péguy will be a very different person from the Des Esseintes of J. K. Huysmans' 'A Rebours,' from the disciple of Alfred de Musset or Baudelaire, from him who has been formed under the influence of 'Les Confessions d'un Enfant du siècle' or of 'Les Fleurs du Mal.' And it is fortunate for France that it is so, that the despairing cry of Alfred de Musset:

'Les plus désespérés sont les chants les plus beaux,
Et j'en sais d'immortels qui sont de purs sanglots'

has been replaced by a song of joy, by a song of hope:

'Une flamme impossible à atteindre, impossible à éteindre au souffle de la mort.'

The new France, strong and disciplined and yet free, full of confidence in herself, full of hope in the future, believing in life and loving life, is nowhere better revealed to us than in the poems of M. Péguy.

We are compelled to pass over in silence many books that deserve to be read, and that are characteristic of the new spirit in France. M. Pierre Lasserre's admirable work on 'Le Romantisme français' must be classed among the most important studies of the Romantic movement. Readers will find here the whole Revolutionary movement, of which Romanticism was an aspect, subjected to criticism so penetrating as to be irresistible. We have already mentioned the poets of Catholic mysticism: MM. Paul Claudel and Francis Jammes. One of the very best contemporary writers of French verse is M. Charles Le Goffic, in whose 'Poésies 'complètes' we seem to be listening to the plaintive murmur of the author's much-loved Brittany. Although the title of

'Prince des Poètes' was conferred, in 1912, on M. Paul Fort, there can be no doubt as to the priority of the claims, not only of M. Charles Le Goffic, but also of M. Louis Le Cardonnel. In the domain of prose MM. Romain Rolland, Ernest Psichari, André Gide, Alphonse de Chateaubriant, André Suarès, René Boylesve, are all writers to be treated with respect and whose books are always interesting. All are, in different ways, excellent representatives of the new France. MM. Paul and Victor Margueritte assuredly deserve to rank high in the same category. But the literature of France is so abundant that the task of those who would analyse its evolution within the limits of an article is an ungrateful one. Omissions are in such a case inevitable.

In 'La Peau de chagrin,' Balzac, whose scathing and merciless pen has drawn so melancholy a picture of human existence, undertook to show us the vanity of all human desires. Life is only possible on condition that we cease to have any wishes. Balzac's rich imagination transported us into a magical world, but more than one generation of Frenchmen was afflicted with the possession of a *peau de chagrin* that prevented all action and destroyed all joy of life. A now extinct type of Frenchman was shown us in J. K. Huysmans' 'A Rebours,' which will remain a masterpiece of realistic literature. But if this type, happily for France, be indeed extinct, this is due to the efforts of the new generation which we see at work to-day, and which has restored the old time-honoured traditions of 'merrie 'France,' of the France that M. Edmond Rostand has celebrated in 'Cyrano de Bergerac' and 'Chantecler,' and to whom the Deity Himself, in M. Péguy's poem, declares :

'Je salue ici ta liberté, ta grâce,
Ta courtoisie.
Ta gracieuseté.
Ta gratitude.
Ta gratuité.'

GEORGES CHATTERTON-HILL.

HOUSTON STEWART CHAMBERLAIN

Das Drama Richard Wagners. 1892:
Richard Wagner. 1895:
Die Grundlagen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. 1899:
Immanuel Kant. 1905.
Goethe. 1912.

FEW men have achieved a literary success equal to that of Houston Stewart Chamberlain, and Englishmen may well be proud of a fellow countryman who is recognised in Germany as one of the most brilliant writers and profound thinkers of the day. Chamberlain started in the race heavily handicapped. He was writing in a foreign tongue for readers of another nationality, and when he published the first edition of his first book, 'Das Drama Richard Wagners,' the German language, as he subsequently confessed, was not fully familiar to him. The book at first fell flat, but it possessed merits so great that it gradually burst the bonds of prejudice, and has now gone through several editions. Germany recognised it as a most masterly piece of criticism, throwing an altogether new light upon works which are perhaps 'caviare to the general.' To listen to one of the great tone-poems, after having gone through the preparation afforded by Chamberlain's book, is a revelation even to those who have listened to Wagner twenty times before. It opens up inner and mystic meanings before unsuspected; and this is all the more remarkable, for this inspired interpreter never knew Wagner or came under his direct influence. It was only after Wagner's death that Chamberlain became intimate with the family at Wahnfried, an intimacy which culminated in a marriage.

Chamberlain's second book was the Life of Wagner, which has been translated into English by Mr. Hight, and in that form is well known in this country. Wagner's working life began in disillusionment and grinding poverty, rendered the more grievous to bear by the continual heartache of an ill-assorted marriage. Bravely he faced misfortune, and at last triumphantly won recognition, the friendship of a much-

loved king, prosperity, and the crowning happiness of sympathy, affection, and a home. After the storm a calm: after the fight peace: under the shade of the trees of that sacred home which he planned and loved he lies at rest.

With the publication of the Life of Wagner Chamberlain's reputation as a German man of letters was secured: there was no longer any need to make excuses on the score of linguistic insufficiency. His next task was a far more serious undertaking. In the 'Grundlagen des neunzehnten Jahr-'hunderts' ('The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century') he attacked the Doctors of Philosophy and the Doctors of Divinity, the Scribes and Pharisees of modern times; he ran a tilt against myths which have been promoted into faiths; he dealt mercilessly with chartered frauds and fallacies and lies; but as a set-off against all this he undertook to prove the value of the supreme services rendered to mankind by the Teuton, the grandest offshoot of the Indo-Aryan stock. The book at once arrested attention; it was bought and read with avidity; it appeared first in 1899, and since then nearly a hundred thousand copies have been sold in spite of its heavy cost. Only last year the stereotyped plates were worn out, and the author was bemoaning the weariness of having to correct the proofs over again—surely a rare sorrow for a writer to have to undergo!

This comprehensive work analyses all those influences, all those human phenomena, some transient, some permanent, that have combined to make up our present civilisation, itself perhaps some day to be counted outworn, but upon which so far we look with not a little complacency. The Indian Aryan, the Assyrian, the Egyptian, the Greek, the Roman, the Jew are all discussed. But of all the influences which combined to make up the nineteenth century—the whole civilization of to-day—none has exercised the same power as that of Christianity. It was inevitable that Chamberlain should dwell upon this; and to the revelation of Christ's short life upon earth he has devoted many pages of a noble prose the beauty of which has been acclaimed by the highest literary authorities in Germany. To deal with it within the limits of a short review, and under the mask of translation, would be an act of injustice.

Some of Chamberlain's opinions are enough to make the

great headmasters of old—Busby, Keate, Arnold, Hawtrey—turn in their graves. In the ancient Greek he, like Gobineau, sees no more than the 'Grec' of modern French slang: Greek soldiers haggling for their price, statesmen watching the nod of the highest bidder. But he gives you chapter and verse for every statement: truth is the rod of his power. In one passage he complains with ironic regret that the enviable faculty of lying has not been vouchsafed to him. For the deeply reflecting metaphysical mind of the old Indian Aryans he entertains the highest admiration, recognising in them the superiors of the shallower Greek philosophers who, unworthy of the loftier thoughts of the Aryan sages, made out of what was the common faith of the Indian coolie the arcana of the adept in Greece. Greek art, on the other hand, he holds in profound reverence. By the grace of art every stone in Greece is hallowed. To the Roman he gives a full meed of praise for his legacies of the law and of the dignity of the family: he shows quite conclusively how vastly superior was the Latin principle, which built up the State on the family, to that of the Greek, who, always dabbling in new constitutions, made the rights of the family of no account, sinking even its testamentary powers in the State. He holds that not the least of the benefits conferred by Rome upon mankind was the 'deletion' of Carthage: had Carthage won the day in the mighty struggle, the Mediterranean regions would have been the prey of Semite superstitions, with all the horrors of slavery and human sacrifices, and the civilisation of Europe would have been delayed by centuries.

But many of Chamberlain's greatest admirers will regret the violence of his attacks upon the Jews. Perhaps his dislike of them is due to the fact that much of his life has been spent in countries where the Jew does not appear to the best advantage. Had he lived, as some of us have done, in the intimacy of the most distinguished Jews—had he witnessed their many charities, the single-hearted generosity of their nature, their true nobility of character—he would have formed another estimate of that wonderful nation. It would almost appear as if the low Polish Jew, whom we see in the sweated tailor of the East End, had sat as model for his picture. But even he—as one of Chamberlain's critics, most laudatory in other respects, has justly pointed out—is what persecution and evil

surroundings have made him. It would be as right to judge Englishmen by the standard of Bill Sikes as to judge the Jews by that of Fagin. Chamberlain himself, in one fine passage in which he contrasts the genuine Sephardim with the lower-grade Ashkenazim, writes :

' I say that it is only when one sees these men, and has intercourse with them, that one begins to comprehend the significance of Judaism in the history of the world. This is nobility in the fullest sense of the word, genuine nobility of race ! Beautiful figures, noble heads, dignity in speech and bearing. The type is Semitic in the same sense as that of certain noble Syrians and Arabs. That out of the midst of such a people Prophets and Psalmists should arise—that I understood at the first glance, which I honestly confess that I had never succeeded in doing when I gazed, however carefully, on the many hundred young Jews—" Bochers "—of the Friedrichstrasse in Berlin.'

Here Chamberlain for once drops his prejudice, and we feel inclined to ask him, According to which class should the Jew be judged ? If, like all financiers, the Jew is *alieni appetens*, he is at any rate *sui profusus*, which is more than can be said of many Christian moneymongers.

The whole scope of ' The Foundations of the Nineteenth ' Century ' is to show how the *Germane*—the Teuton—has been the dominant influence in the growth of the world's civilisation. Upon this task Chamberlain brings to bear an unheard-of store of knowledge, natural science, and general learning ; moreover, he knows how to make use of his knowledge—a very necessary power, without which knowledge is like a park of artillery in the hands of apes. As Rousseau said, ' C'est le ' génie qui rend le savoir utile.' One of the most interesting chapters tells how the advent of the Teuton, ' one of the ' greatest, if not the greatest power in the history of mankind,' made an almost clean sweep (alas ! that it should only have been a case of ' almost ') of the vile chaos which resulted from the decline of the Roman Empire. It is refreshing to find the much-abused Goth in the character of a liberator :

' This barbarian, who would rush naked to battle, this savage who suddenly sprang out of forests and marshes to inspire into a civilised and cultivated world the terrors of a violent conquest won by the strong hand alone, was nevertheless the lawful heir of the Hellene and the Roman, blood of their blood, spirit of their spirit. It was his own property which he, unwitting, snatched from the alien hand. But for him the sun of the Indo-European must have set. The Asiatic and African slave had by assassination

wormed his way to the very throne of the Roman Empire; the Syrian mongrel had made himself master of the law; the Jew was using the library at Alexandria to adapt Hellenic philosophy to the Mosaic law, the Egyptian to embalm and bury for boundless ages the fresh bloom of natural science in the ostentatious pyramid of scientific systematisation; soon too the beautiful flowers of old Aryan life—Indian thought, Indian poetry—were to be trodden under foot by the savage, bloodthirsty Mongolian; and the Bedouin with his mad delusions, bred of the desert, was to reduce to an everlasting wilderness that garden of Eden, Irania, in which for centuries all the symbolism of the world had grown; art had long since vanished: there were nothing but replicas for the rich, and for the poor the circus.'

That is Chamberlain's picture of the world into which the fair-haired giant strode victorious. It was an Augean stable; its cleansing, the work of a Hercules. The Teuton was a man of many tribes, but as Tacitus said, 'the characteristics of all 'these men are the same'; and again, 'I am convinced that the 'various tribes of Germania, unpolluted by marriages with 'alien peoples, have from time immemorial been a special, 'unmixed people resembling itself alone.'* A fighting man the Teuton was from his birth—fighting his own kith and kin where there was no other foe. Tiberius saw the danger, and wished to adopt a sort of Kilkenny-cat policy, leaving the barbarians to destroy one another in their own private feuds. They were reserved for better destinies. Men so various as Dante† and Luther are patterns among the countless heroes of the Teuton race. The crowning work was the Reformation, a fight for the freedom of the soul—freedom! ever the war cry of the Teuton, and the secret of Anglo-Saxon success throughout the world.

The book on Kant followed the 'Foundations.' It appeared at an opportune moment. Kant had said that he was born too soon, that his morning would not dawn till a century after his death. It was just after the centenary of his death that Chamberlain, in 1905, gave to the world the result of a life's devoted study and love. The book was received with acclamation: professors, doctors of philosophy, and doctors of all the various faculties in which German universities give degrees, vied with one another in its praise: it was good to see the whole-hearted

* Germania 4, quoted by Chamberlain.

† 'The name Alighieri is Gothic,' says Chamberlain in a note; 'it came into the family through Dante's grandmother on the 'father's side, a Goth from Ferrara, whose name was Aldigiero.'

generosity with which they welcomed the work of a foreigner upon whom they might conceivably, without any great stretch of the imagination, have looked as a poacher in their preserves. It is a notable book, the aim of which is not so much a review of all Kant's philosophy and literary achievements, as an introduction, a sort of preliminary study, which should enable the neophyte to enter the school of the great thinker armed with some knowledge of his ways and methods. Chamberlain brushes away the cobwebs of prejudice and misrepresentation, and throws light upon many a dark corner which under his sympathetic touch becomes bright and clear to the veriest tyro. It reminds one of what Goethe said of Kant himself: 'When one reads him one feels as if one were entering a 'brilliantly lighted chamber.' Such mysteries as the 'cate-'gorical imperative,' the 'unconditioned *must*,' the 'thing in 'itself,' upon which pseudo-learning has wasted reams of paper and gallons of ink, are robbed of their terrors, and cease to be bugbears to scare the uninitiated; the searcher after truth in the realm of thought is led, kindly and gently, to that doctrine which Kant himself has summed up in the words 'I teach 'what we must be in order to be men.' With this end in view our guide dwells upon the intellectual personality of Kant; he desires to show him, not as the repellently abstruse propounder of metaphysical enigmas that he is generally supposed to be, but on the contrary as a 'simple and accessible' teacher, lovable for that very reason. There is one point upon which Chamberlain insists over and over again. There is a sort of general impression upon the minds of those who do not know Kant that he was an irreligious man, and that on that account his doctrine is dangerous. Nothing could be further from the truth. He looked upon religion as 'a necessity,' as 'a duty which man owes to himself.' He admitted the advantage to mankind of the discipline of the Churches, his leaning being perhaps rather towards the Roman Catholic confession. Free his thought may have been—it was never irreligious.

It would be difficult to find a more striking example of a man possessing what Goethe called the 'happiness of 'personality' than Kant. He was of diminutive stature, barely five feet high, as one authority tells us. His portrait shows a sharp, anxious face, with a thoughtful brow; but the most remarkable feature in him, as in Goethe, was the eye:

his contemporaries never weary of praising its beauty; it symbolised the whole penetration of his marvellous brain; it was indeed Leonardo's 'finestra dell' anima.' One of his friends, writing of that wonderful eye, said that:

'it not only bore witness to the purity and clearness of his soul, but at the same time gave expression to his kindliness and good will. Especially would his eyes blaze upwards when at table, after remaining for a few moments with bent head engrossed in thought, he would suddenly look up and address some person present. It was as if a peaceful light streaming from him were spreading itself over his words, illuminating everything around it.'

His senses were acute: to the end he could read the smallest print; his hearing was so sharp that the slightest rustle in the distance disturbed him; his sense of smell was no less keen. He cared not a jot for art: pictures represented to him no more than the vanity of the possessor; with the exception of a portrait of Rousseau his own walls remained callow, his rooms without ornament; on the other hand, he liked to clothe himself in fine raiment 'out of respect for those who 'might visit him,' and in those days men did literally wear purple and fine linen: have we not all of us laughed with Dr. Johnson and the wits over Goldsmith's plum-coloured coat? In reading Kant was omnivorous, but the books he loved best were geographical and anthropological works; and whatever he read he retained: his contemporary and biographer, Jachmann, tells how on one occasion, an Englishman being present, the conversation turned upon Westminster Bridge, and Kant helped out the Londoner in his description of it with as great accuracy as if he had been the surveyor who took out the quantities for its construction. He who had never left Königsberg since he was born there—who had never been further than a little forester's house a mile off, to which he would go in summer for a day or two to drink in the perfume of the woodland air—could talk of the cities of Italy and their beauties as if he had spent years in making the Grand Tour. His forecasts of the great revolutionary wars, his appreciations of the leading characters in the tragedy upon which the curtain of the eighteenth century fell, were keener even than those of Goethe. His lectures upon geography and anthropology were so attractive that his room was all too small to hold his audiences. In mathematics, physics, chemistry, natural history, and books of travel he

delighted—philosophical works he would not read ; it mattered little to him whether they were for him or against him ; Fichte's 'Wissenschaftslehre' he did indeed deign to attack with energy, not from any love of the subject, but simply for the reason that it was upon his teaching that Fichte pretended to base himself. Striking indeed is Kant's practical contempt for, or at any rate indifference to, the philosophy of the university professor, what Paracelsus called 'the red cloak, the 'trencher cap and the four-cornered fool.' He was essentially the man of experience. He would not busy himself with the hair-splittings of this or that metaphysician. His order of thought was based upon fact—nothing outside of experience had any value for him. 'We can only understand that which 'we ourselves can do,' was a great and a pregnant saying of his.

Kant's occupation of the philosophical chair at Königsberg was more or less an accident ; he was originally the professor of mathematics, and it was an exchange with a colleague which was the cause of his leaving the exact science which he loved for the lecture room which he loved less, but which he made so famous. It was his deep knowledge of all exact science which gave him such a mastery over theoretical science. That his was a difficult intellect to follow no one will dispute : he knew it full well himself ; 'all that I want is to be under-'stood,' he cried, yet he was grievously misunderstood and misrepresented by the very men whose works owed so much to him—such men as Herder, Fichte, and Schopenhauer.

The object of Chamberlain's book is to introduce us to Kant the man, and Kant the intellectual personality. Whoso thinks that after reading it he has mastered, or indeed approached to, a knowledge of the great thinker's legacy to posterity, will have completely misunderstood Chamberlain. He shows us what Kant's method of thought was, and gives us an appreciation of what he calls Kant's 'style' of thought. For the goal to which that method, that style, led, we must go to Kant himself ; we have been introduced to him by a most sympathetic common friend ; further than that no middleman can go. The rest lies with us. Chamberlain, as he himself puts it, leaves us on the threshold.

The scheme of the book in which Chamberlain has embodied this design is as original as it is fascinating. 'How,' he asks, 'can such a task be fulfilled ? In my opinion there is only one

'way: that of comparison'; and he quotes Buffon's great saying: 'Nous ne pouvons acquérir de connaissances que par la 'voie de la comparaison.' Comparison is the soul of observation. By bringing forward five of the greatest prophets of wisdom that mankind has known, and by contrasting their methods of thought and reasoning with those of Kant, he reveals to us the peculiarities as well as the wealth of the great master's intellect. Goethe, Leonardo da Vinci, Descartes, Giordano Bruno, Plato—a brilliant constellation out of the great stars that have enlightened the world! These five essays, worthy of the illustrious names which they bear, are in themselves monuments of that encyclopaedic learning for which Chamberlain's 'Foundations of the Nineteenth Century' had already made him famous. They are moreover patterns of comparative criticism.

The contrast with Goethe is the more interesting in that no other two men could be found who have exercised so deep an influence upon the German intellect. Yet Kant's power of perception is, as it were, the converse of that of Goethe. If ever a man possessed an eye to see, it was Goethe. As he himself said in 'Dichtung und Wahrheit' (Fiction and Truth), 'The 'eye was above all others the organ with which I grasped the 'world.' Again, 'I am one of those Ephesian goldsmiths who 'has passed his whole life in beholding and admiring and 'worshipping the wondrous temple of the goddess, and in the 'representation of her mysterious forms.'*

It was his marvellous power of sight which filled his brain with new ideas, leading to such contributions to natural science as the law of antagonistic colours, the discovery of the intermaxillary bone, and theories in optics and botany which were, in truth, not so much theories as the result of observed facts. He was but twenty years old when he noted 'the 'almost incomprehensible proposition that the studio of the 'great artist does more for the development of the philosopher 'in embryo than the lecture room of the sage and the critic.' Schiller it was who led Goethe to Kant, and Goethe became one of Kant's most convinced admirers, declaring that his thoughts had penetrated so deeply into German culture that henceforth it must be impossible even for the man who does not read him to escape from his influence. 'I followed instinctively the

* Letter to Jacobi in 1812, when he was sixty-three years old.

'same road as Kant.' And yet, to the end of his days, Goethe could not refrain from a certain tendency to look upon ideas which he had hardly even formulated as facts of experience. To quote Chamberlain's words: 'Goethe arrives at wisdom 'through art.' Whereas, 'Of Kant we may say that from his 'youth up he obstinately closed his organs of sense, the eye and 'the ear.' Kant is attracted by no art—of architecture, of painting, sculpture, music, of all those charms which make up the life of a man of culture, he knows nothing, or if he knows aught he keeps it locked in his breast. He can read of these things and discourse of them, as we have seen, but visually and as influences upon the senses they say nothing to him. He can talk of chemistry without ever having held a reagent glass in his hand or set his eyes upon a retort. Goethe's world was what he himself called 'the world of the eye'; Kant's world was the world of reason.

Another study drawn from 'the world of the eye' is the portrait of Leonardo da Vinci, whose whole life was a contradiction of Schopenhauer's audacious assertion that genius and a head for mathematics are contradictory terms. Chamberlain has no difficulty in controverting such nonsense. He has but to cite Albrecht Dürer, the author of the first text-book of applied geometry in the German language, his pregnant mathematical treatise on fortification, his work on human proportions, and his great dictum 'The art of mensuration is 'the right foundation of all painting,' and the fallacy is swept away. Leonardo with his countless problems scattered all over his sketches and his protest, 'Non mi legga chi non è 'matematico' ('Let no man read me who is not a mathema-'tician'), and his 'No human investigation can lay claim to be 'true science unless it can stand the test of mathematical 'demonstration.'* These give the lie to Schopenhauer forcibly enough. It was by mathematics that Leonardo arrived at his great discoveries, and his still greater premonitions. In his mathematical studies he stood above Goethe, whose tastes and abilities did not lie in that direction, though he held the science in the highest esteem and declared it to be the greatest achievement of which the human intellect is capable. Here, in geometrical schematisation especially, Leonardo stood very

* Compare with this Kant's saying: 'In every special natural science there is only so much true science as it contains of mathematics.' (Metaphysical Foundation of Natural Science.)

near to Kant. Yet in Leonardo as in Goethe the eye is the dominant power. In his view all the arts, all the sciences, all thought, are 'the daughters of the eye,' and the painter is by right of it *nipote a Dio*, the grandchild of God.

Descartes belongs to another order of thought. Descartes has all the fascination of a French grand seigneur; he was a man of noble birth—the Seigneur Duperron was his title—and when he was but twenty-three years old he was in winter quarters with his regiment at Neuburg on the Danube. Wearied with the do-nothing life he took to mathematics because *elles accoutument l'esprit à se repaître de vérités*, and so, soon after leaving the army, he started upon the career which was to lead to the invention of analytical geometry, the foundation of all modern science. Here is Chamberlain's account of his manner of life:

'To-day he is hunting with Wallenstein over the plains of Bohemia, to-morrow he writes a treatise on acoustics, the day after to-morrow a comedy; to-day he constructs a telescope to search the depths of the heavens; to-morrow he is dissecting animals to discover the secret of the circulation of the blood; the next day he makes experiments upon the weight of air and refraction of light; one day he discovers the ether, the second day analytical geometry, the third the scheme of bodies in motion. That is indeed a full life, a perpetual communion between man and nature.'

The relation of Descartes to Kant is shown in his own words: 'Il n'est aucune question plus importante à résoudre que celle 'de savoir ce que c'est que la connaissance humaine. . . . 'Rien ne semble plus absurde que de discuter audacieusement 'sur les mystères de la nature sans avoir une seule fois cherché 'si l'esprit humain peut atteindre jusque-là.' The first part of that quotation is just the counterpart of Kant's 'what a 'man must be in order to be a man.' Descartes, on the other hand, himself more than once uses the expression 'pure 'reason.'

Giordano Bruno, the recalcitrant Dominican friar who at the stake paid his debt to the Church, is brought in as the fourth foil to Kant. No methods of philosophising could be more different. Both have been grievously misunderstood. It has been the fashion to look upon Bruno as the martyr of progress. What he suffered for was his defection from such fundamental doctrines of the Church as Transubstantiation and the Immaculate Conception, and he was hounded from country to country, notably from England, on account of his

opposition to Aristotelian views : but as regards his philosophy he was essentially a schoolman, a dialectician, a bookworm. Kant held anything approaching to dialectics in such horror that, being on one occasion complimented upon ' The Critique ' of Pure Reason ' as a masterpiece of dialectics, he flamed up in a fury, declaring that his whole experience in criticism had been directed to destroying for all time those dialectics in which pure reason is enmeshed and entangled.

The fifth foil is Plato. Physically it is difficult to conceive a greater contrast than that between Agathocles, nicknamed Plato on account of his broad shoulders, a handsome, parsley-crowned athlete of the Isthmian games, and the dainty philosopher of Königsberg, his tiny person, fragile and puny, cased in velvet, belaced and beruffled. But the two intellects were so alike that, as one critic has pointed out, Plato's philosophy was, as it were, a glorious sketch which Kant worked up into a solid monumental structure.

We can unfortunately do no more than hint at Chamberlain's last great work, the ' Goethe,' which came out in the autumn of 1912. When it was announced, grave men, Germans, shook their heads and one competent critic said to the present writer, ' Goethe is like a squeezed orange. How ' can your friend deal with him ? ' Well, the book appeared—and conquered. It seemed that the orange was not yet exhausted. New criticisms, new views were brought to light, and the Germans who contend that they understand Shakespeare better than we do, had to confess that an Englishman had revealed to them a new Goethe. As one critic wrote, here was the man who was ' predestined ' to be the exponent of the great poet, philosopher, scientist, statesman. Chamberlain's early scientific studies, his deeply philosophical mind, equipped him fully for the work which he had undertaken : these made him able to show Goethe's greatness : his knowledge of mathematics and of exact science enabled him to detect where Goethe failed. The book is a grand example of biography, natural history, philosophy, and criticism. Is it too much to hope that some scholar, worthy of the task, may give England an adequate version of a masterpiece drawn, to use an expression of Goethe's own, ' from the depths of humanity ' ?

REDESDALE.

UTOPIAN TOLERATION

1. **More's English Works.** Cawood, Waley, and Tottell. 1557.
2. **More's Latin Works.** Basle. 1563.
3. **Tres Thomae.** By THOMAS STAPLETON. Douai. 1588.
4. **The Life of Sir Thomas More.** By his son-in-law, WILLIAM ROPER. Singer's Edition. 1822.
5. **Fragmenta quarundam Thomae Mori Epistolarum ad Johannem Cochlaeum.** Lipsiae. 1536.
6. **Opus epistolarum D. Erasmi.** Basilea. 1529. Also the noble edition by Mr. P. S. ALLEN. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1906. In Progress (to the year 1519 at present).
7. **Renaissance et Réforme.** Par D. NISARD. Paris. 1877.
8. **Life and Writings of Sir Thomas More.** By the REV. T. E. BRIDGETT. Burns and Oates. 1891.
9. **Calendar of Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the reign of Henry VIII.** Edited by J. S. BREWER and J. GAIRDNER. Volumes I. to IX. Wyman.
10. **History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada.** By J. A. FROUDE. Longmans, Green, and Co. 1900.
11. **Lollardy and the Reformation in England.** By J. GAIRDNER. Volumes I. and II. Macmillan. 1908.
12. **The Oxford Reformers, John Colet, Erasmus and Thomas More.** By F. SEEBOHM. Longmans, Green, and Co. 1911.

THE ancients and the medievalists ignored an idea which permeates the whole of our social philosophy, the idea of progress. As M. Delaville has shown in his suggestive 'Essai sur l'Histoire de l'Idée de Progrès,' not only the philosophers but even the lawyers of antiquity and of the Middle Ages erred, as the founders of the great religious orders erred, in trying to substitute uniformity for variety, tradition for invention, and stability for movement. In these respects we have outgrown the wisdom of Greece and the sagacity of Rome. But we may find matter for thought in the reflection that the freest and most enlightened nations of antiquity, the nations rich beyond all others in vigour and originality of individuality, understood by freedom something quite

different from that which the term conveys to our ears. The medieval ideal, like the classical, lay in the past, and the best hope for men was to recover something of what they had once possessed. In the twentieth century the Golden Age is fondly believed to be coming, but in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries all thinkers looked backwards.

At first sight it seems a strange phenomenon that before the Renaissance no independent work had appeared for nearly fifteen hundred years on such an important subject as the ideal State—none since the time of Cicero if we except the 'De 'Civitate Dei' of St. Augustine and the 'De Monarchia' of Dante. In these two treatises Platonic influence is easily discerned: the Monarcha of Dante's work is Plato's heaven-born statesman. The reason is that until after the Renaissance there was no conscious desire for moral or political speculation. Under the world-empire of Rome the absence of independent political life combined with the vast development of municipal law and administration left little room for the dreams of philosophers. The world-emperor ruled over the world-empire; that was enough for the Roman lawyers. Imaginary and impossible States had for them not a vestige of interest. Speculation as to the form or the end of government was scarcely possible—was certainly unpractical—so long as men deemed the Holy Roman Emperor the successor of the Caesars. All were quite content to accept unquestioningly the theory of the Holy Roman Empire. Loyalty to king or feudal lord was habitual or natural, unless the rule was very oppressive, or unless their immediate lord rebelled.

Travellers tell us that in Arctic regions a vessel sometimes lies for a long time firmly bound in a vast field of ice. The sailor who week after week surveys from the masthead the monotonous expanse of whiteness sees an apparently solid surface, motionless and immovable, yet all the time the ice is steadily drifting to the south, carrying with it the embedded ship. At last, when warmer climes are reached, that which in the night seemed a rigid mass is in the light of dawn a tossing mass of ice-blocks, through which the vessel finds her homeward path. So it was throughout the Middle Ages. Beyond question these ages were largely unpolitical; even so the human mind was not content to do without a living and active political theory. Speculation was not so energetic as in modern times; yet a few had been pondering over the conditions of member-

ship of the national States just then arising. Such a thinker was Marsilius of Padua, whose remarkable book, 'Defensor 'Pacis,' published in 1325, marks a stage in the growth of medieval toleration. In it the writer asserts the complete authority of the civil power and the purely voluntary nature of religious organisation. He therefore necessarily repudiates every kind of political claim put forward on behalf of the ecclesiastical organisation, and with this repudiation he exposes the iniquity of persecution. 'The rights of the citizens,' concludes Marsilius, 'are independent of the faith they profess ; 'and no man may be punished for his religion.' St. Athanasius and St. Ambrose never protested more powerfully on behalf of liberty of conscience.

The voice of Marsilius of Padua awoke no responsive echo. In medieval times the alliance between Christianity and the Empire became so firmly welded that the Church was not *a* State, it was *the* State. The State as such was merely the secular side of the universal ecclesiastical corporation. The Church took over from the Roman Empire its theory of the absolute jurisdiction of the sovereign authority. It developed this doctrine into the *plenitudo potestatis* of its head, who was the ultimate dispenser of law, the sole legitimate source of all earthly power. There were struggles between the Pope and the Emperor, but the contest lay between two officials, never between two separate and distinct bodies. There was no quarrel between Church and State in our sense of the term ;—this statement is as true of Dante and Marsilius as it is of Boniface and Augustinus. The vice of the medieval State, like that of the classical, was that it united Church and State in one. The fundamental idea of the medieval mind was that of a uniform single empire—it never contemplated the absurdity of several empires—resting entirely upon a Christian basis. The medieval basis of unity was undoubtedly religious. No heretic, no schismatic, no excommunicate could possibly enjoy the rights of citizenship. This principle, founded on the code of Justinian, formed the ground of the claim of the Pope to bind and unloose the allegiance of the subject to the Holy Roman Emperor, a claim that brought almost all his woes upon the head of the unfortunate Roman Catholic. Herbert Spencer teaches us that evolution lies largely in the change from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, but a medieval mind could grasp no such conception. Till the days of Machiavelli

politics and theology are practically synonymous terms. There was little toleration practised, for such a conception was never grasped by the people.*

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries that new birth of the human spirit which we call the Renaissance took place. Man conceived a passionate desire for extending the limits of human knowledge and for employing his powers to newer and better advantage. The general ferment and the shaking of men's traditional beliefs extended to all departments of human thought, even to the fundamental questions of society itself. It was towards the close of the Middle Ages that the enormously powerful influence of Greek art and literature began to mould the world. Admiration for antiquity became the hall-mark of the Renaissance. Art and literature threw off to a very large extent the forms of medievalism and looked for all their inspiration to the models of the classical world. The dominant intellectual note of the age was freedom—freedom from the restraints which had been imposed upon men's thoughts and actions by the methods and dogmas of the schoolmen, and freedom to revel in every species of activity which the untrammelled spirit of the ancients had suggested. The free critical methods of the new movement are readily discernible in the doctrines of the time. While, however, each man of letters asserted his freedom to his own opinions, he had but little interest that others should enjoy the same measure of toleration ; this forms a marked characteristic of the scholars of the New Learning.

While men's minds were thus speculating, the grand geographical discoveries of the age assisted in upsetting the medieval pre-conceived notions as to world-empire. Men indeed, to use M. Taine's picturesque phrase, opened their eyes and saw. They saw the physical bounds of the universe suddenly and enormously enlarged. For the discoveries of Nicholas de Cusa and of Nicholas Copernicus shadowed forth the secret of the universe. The New World, in a sense not far different from Canning's, did undoubtedly redress the balance of the Old. The New World, or rather the New Worlds, were added to the Old, and the conception of an apparently limitless

---

* The reader will find these matters ably developed in Dr. Figgis's 'From Gerson to Grotius.'

continent destroyed that of a limited one. Men for the first time got a more correct idea of the globe they were inhabiting. Hitherto they had not even professed to have any knowledge of geography; there is no mention of it in the Trivium and Quadrivium, which were then supposed to form a cycle of things known, if not of things knowable. Dante had made the conception of the nearness of hell very vivid, and it formed a grave obstacle to the work of the navigator. The medieval mind placed the happy Isles of the Blessed in the mysterious west, and, illogically enough, located the openings into hell in the same region. Naturally sailors did not care to adventure too far from land when such a belief was prevalent. In a medieval text-book occurs the question 'Why is the 'sun so red in the evening?' Answer: 'Because he looketh 'down upon hell.'

If the thirteenth century be the most wonderful the world has seen, surely the year 1492 is the most wonderful year Anno Domini. For then Columbus discovered America, and the mind of Copernicus was seething with ideas destined to overthrow the Ptolemaic system. Three national monarchs were reigning in England, France, and Spain. Bacon's *tres magi*, Henry VII., Louis XI., and Ferdinand the Catholic, ruled over consolidated kingdoms, the latter in this very year conquering Granada. Then Lorenzo de' Medici died, and with his death France entered upon her part in the creation of international European relations. Thus she came into intimate contact with Spain and Germany, feeling powerfully the influence of Italy. Because of her relations with the last country, France in this fateful year began a career which in the end compelled her to cast in her lot with Latin nations, not with Teutonic, when the Reformation question pressed for settlement. With her England concluded the Treaty of Étaples, marking the rise of modern commerce. In Germany the peasants of Kempten still continued their revolt against feudal oppression. On the other hand, by the influence of Torquemada the Jews were expelled from Spain, and 150,000 had to abandon their homes. The Moors also could this year read their doom of expulsion. The world of 1492 was then composed of medieval and comparatively modern elements. An undergraduate at the University of Oxford, Thomas More by name, surveyed this medley with precocious eyes, and his whole after-life was coloured by the mixture of new and old.

To the voyages of Amerigo Vespucci, More owes the form of the imaginary commonwealth he described twenty-three years later. He tells us that the traveller who had 'joyned 'himselfe in company with Americke Vespuce' remained in South America with some four-and-twenty companions. They roam through many countries, and at length make their way westwards home by land and sea. The imaginary traveller is Hythloday or Expert in Nonsense; and in his wanderings his attention directs itself to the island of Utopia or Nowhere. Here the injustice and inequality dominant in the Old World are quite unknown, and the vision of the perfect State he sees is one which surely would in many ways have satisfied the soul of Plato. More, the best man of his time, stands out against the background of eternal truth as he points the way to justice, which is supreme in his imaginary island. He longed with intense earnestness to see a true community—not a rich and educated aristocracy existing side by side with poor ignorant peasantry—one people, prosperous and educated through all its different classes. This yearning for the weal of all humanity marks the advance of the Utopian ideal on the Greek. Progress is seen most distinctly in the growing recognition of the dignity of man and woman. On the other hand, the Athenian love of art, of beauty, is sadly wanting in the island.

The moral code in Utopia allows of suicide, divorce, and slavery under certain restrictions. No one is allowed to kill himself without public authority, but in cases of incurably painful disease the priests and magistrates recommend the patient to find his way out of life. Divorces are granted for adultery and for the 'intolerable wayward manners of either 'party,' the guilty party in that case living ever after in infamy and single. Breakers of wedlock are reduced to slavery; if such slaves prove unruly they are put to death 'as desperate and wild beasts.' Simplicity reigns in the Utopian institutions. The laws, writes Hythloday, the mouthpiece of the future Lord Chancellor of England, are very few; so that 'every man is a cunning lawyer.' He shows himself three centuries in advance of his age by stigmatising the Draconian legislation which, in this country till the commencement of the last century, hanged a man for stealing goods to the value of forty shillings. The end of all punish-

ment he declares to be reformation, 'nothing else but the 'destruction of vice and the saving of men.' He has also a clear anticipation of our ticket-of-leave system.

Hythloday is a warm advocate of communism. More himself raises objections; but his mind appears to be spoken through the mouth of the Portuguese mariner. For, like Plato, More prefers public duties to private, and is somewhat impatient of the importance of relations. To Platonic inspiration is due the impassioned argument in favour of community of goods. To the 'Republic' is directly traceable the leading feature in the constitution of the happy island, namely, equality in all things, and this is also the cardinal tenet in the socialism of our own day. Do the more revolutionary passages of the 'Utopia' express the author's real convictions? This is of course a difficult question to decide. But it is beyond controversy that the publication of the story of Ralph Hythloday opened the chapter of modern Socialism. The import of the book lies above all in the freedom with which it examined and criticised principles which nearly all political treatises assume. It boldly put forward the assumption that society might be conceived in some radically different form. While the Reformers were calling on the civil powers to arm against the downtrodden peasants of Germany, More was earnestly pleading the cause of the workers. Social and political arrangements are tested by the convenience and claims of the working-classes. The recognition of the community as a moral organism, the proclamation of the right and duty to work, the State organisation of production, the abolition of coinage, are all articles of the socialistic creed. Promulgated in the 'Utopia,' they have set a train of speculation in motion of which the full effects are not yet seen.

More is well aware of the virtues of toleration. The Utopians adore some the sun, others the moon, others a star, others a deified man, others—the philosophers among them—a Great Unknown. But they all acknowledge one supreme Deity, called Mithras. All manner of religious opinions are tolerated, except those that deny the immortality of the soul or the retributive justice of God in the next life. Heretics on either of these two points are excluded from holding office; otherwise they go unmolested, but they are not allowed to argue on behalf of their opinions before an ignorant multitude.

They are excluded because their views are deemed to be degrading to mankind and therefore to incapacitate those who hold them from governing in a noble temper. Utopus, the first king of the island, ordered toleration ' as not knowing ' whether God, desiring manifold and diverse sorts of honour, ' did not inspire sundry men with sundry kinds of religion.' Moreover, the people were ' persuaded that it is not in a man's ' power to believe what he list. No, nor they constrain him ' not with threatenings to dissemble his mind and show coun- ' tenance contrary to his thought. For deceit and all manner ' of lies they do marvellously detest and abhor.' What we may call the Church by law established teaches three articles : that there is a God, that the soul of man is immortal, and that God will reward the good and punish the wicked. The priests are ' of exceeding holiness, and therefore few,' thirteen only in each city, with a bishop at their head ; they are chosen by the people by ballot. Besides religious ministrations, they instruct the young and superintend public morals, and their rebuke, like the *nota* of the censors in the Roman republic, carries with it great disgrace. Religion found its centre in the family rather than in the congregation ; each household confessed its faults to its own natural head, the patriarch. The Christians of Utopia were in doubt whether they could not elect their own priests, thus dispensing with apostolic succession or with the authority of a bishop consecrated by the Pope—points of the very essence of Catholicism.

More's attitude to toleration is most clearly seen in the following :

' King Utopus made a decree that it should be lawful for every man to favour and follow what religion he would, and that he might do the best he could to bring others to his opinion, so that he did it peaceably, gently, quietly and soberly, without hasty and contentious rebuking and inveighing against others. If he could not by firm and gentle speeches induce them into his opinion, yet he should use no kind of violence, and refrain from displeasant and seditious words. This law did King Utopus make not only for the maintenance of peace, which he saw through continual contention and mortal hatred utterly extinguished ; but also because he thought this decree should make for the furtherance of religion. Though there be one religion which alone is true and all others vain and superstitious, yet did he well foresee that the truth of the one power would at last issue out and come to light. But if contention and debate should be continually used—as the worst men be most obstinate

and stubborn, and in their evil opinion most constant—he perceived that then the best and holiest religion could be trodden underfoot and destroyed by most vain superstitions. Therefore all this matter he left undiscussed, and gave to every man free liberty and choice to believe what he would.'

The sentiments are fine, but they are not a whit more clear than those of Tertullian, who lived thirteen hundred years before Sir Thomas More. In a remarkable passage Lord Acton succeeds in showing not only that in the early part of the sixteenth century More did not stand alone in his belief, but that his belief was practised on a fairly wide scale from about 1510 to 1530.* In England and in Germany no doubt the old persecuting spirit was not exorcised, but in many other countries it was. Erasmus warmly extols the light and liberty which he found at Rome in 1515. This is all the more remarkable when we remember that the 'Encomium Moriae' was published in 1512, censuring bishops, cardinals, and popes. Leo X. displayed very great tolerance, accepting the dedication of Erasmus's Greek Testament. Across the Channel the Inquisition found its powers severely curtailed, and the French bishops refused to bring before it those who were accused of heresy. Even Lutheranism was allowed to spread with the connivance of the Court of Francis I., and for many years the converts persisted in regarding the king as their defender. In Savoy the unfortunate Waldenses were given a quiet time. Undoubtedly the Hapsburgs continued to persecute, though it is worthy of remark that in 1526 Ferdinand permitted the existence of the principle *cujus regio ejus religio*, and that in 1532 Charles V. spoke nobly of the rights of conscience. The tendency to toleration may also be witnessed in other fragments of the Holy Roman Empire. In Denmark the Diet of 1527 assigned equal rights to Protestants and Catholics. In spite of the evil memories of the Hussite Wars, in 1512 the Bohemian Catholics and Utraquists made an agreement in perpetuity that the rich and poor of both Churches should enjoy freedom unrestrained. In Venice the members of the Greek Orthodox Church worshipped God as their conscience dictated. The laws of Emmanuel the Great protected the Judaising heretics from the fury of the Portuguese mob. The fall of Granada removed the remains of political

* Historical Essays and Studies, pp. 63–4.

power from the Moors, yet, powerful as Torquemada was, Ferdinand the Catholic refused to allow the Inquisition to claim them as under its sway. The last instance is not perhaps fair. Society did not acknowledge the same obligations to a Turk as to a Christian. Toleration was not so easily shown to one who deviated from the faith into which he had been baptised, though it might be displayed to others.

More, then, was not exceptional in advocating the cause of toleration. In the fourteenth century theological thought and intellectual speculation were much more free than in the sixteenth. He had the example of thinkers in the past, and he had also the example of the practice of the present. He was, however, partly old and partly new. In the latter capacity he thought first and last of truth, while in the former he cared for good and evil. He is a memorable instance of the truth of Coleridge's aphorism that 'he who begins by 'loving Christianity better than Truth, will proceed by loving 'his own sect or Church better than Christianity.' Toleration was ideal; but what if it brought evil as well as good, if it destroyed the unity of the Church he loved, if it achieved the disintegration and misery of his country? When he wrote the 'Utopia' he had no personal experience of heretics or of the assaults they might make on life and property, though his knowledge of contemporary history should have enlightened him. When he became Lord Chancellor the sack of Rome, the horrors of the Peasant wars, and the Anabaptist ideas had altered his views. Then were advocated such doctrines as that a simple agreement between man and woman is all that is necessary to wedlock; that the baptism of a child of Christian parents is not only superfluous but even wrong; or that the murder of Archbishop Sudbury by the mob was a righteous act. 'Friend Roper,' he said wistfully, 'I pray God that some of us, high as we seem to sit 'upon the mountains, treading heretics under our feet like 'ants, live not to see the day when we gladly would wish to 'be at league with them, to let them have their churches 'quietly to themselves, so that they would be contented to 'let us have ours quietly to ourselves.' It is plain that he regarded England and Europe as on the brink of 'red 'ruin and the breaking up of laws.' In the true spirit of the More of later days Burke maintained 'I will not enter into

'the question how much truth is preferable to peace. Perhaps 'truth may be far better. But as we have scarcely ever the 'same certainty in the one we have in the other, I would— 'unless the truth were evident indeed—hold fast to peace 'which has in his company charity the highest of the virtues.'* To the Irish thinker as to the English, the secular and the lay elements were really one. 'In a Christian commonwealth,' declared the former, 'the Church and the State are one and 'the same thing, being different integral parts of the same 'whole.' † Both were alike in regarding the utter dependence of national life and its continuity on religious consciousness, without which, to use the language of Burke, 'no one genera- 'tion could link with another' and 'men become little better 'than the flies of a summer.' The paradox in Plato which declares that it is in vain to expect any man to be a great statesman unless he cares for something greater than politics, applies to both.

To draw a parallel between the attitude of More to the German Reformation and that of Burke to the French Revolution is tempting and profitable. Each regarded the movements of their day as religious and proselytising. Each perceived intuitively that there could be no peace between the new spirit and the old, and each desired to use force to crush the former, Nothing is so much in the mind of both as the conception of harmony and organic unity, and nothing is so much removed from it as forces making for confusion and disorder. Both believed in the moral government of the universe, and both felt certain that the Reformation and the Revolution respectively would not only subvert political institutions but would rob the world of its faith. Both saw the men of the new *régime* call in question the obligations of society, civil and religious, and both shrank from the right to revolution advocated in the sixteenth and in the eighteenth centuries respectively.

To More civilisation and order were tolerably synonymous terms. He might hold views, advanced for his day, upon the distribution of property, the domestic relations, and the like, yet he held firm faith in civilisation based upon Catholicism. His mind realised in part the shock given to the principle

* Speech, February 6, 1772. † Speech, May 11, 1792.

of authority by the changes of the fifteenth century, while the whole man did not realise that the social system most urgently demanded reorganisation. Its foundations had been completely undermined by the events of the year 1492, and the stones of the seemingly stately edifice had received a blow from which they could only hope to recover by fresh support. More's reading of history revealed a past devoid of radical changes. The living organism of human society had worked almost mechanically for hundreds of years. Its members, its circulation, its nervous system, and a sort of skin, consisting of its laws and institutions, seemed still the same. One is not altogether surprised to find that More was unable to see that a simultaneous set of changes had burst the worn-out skin. Dominated by the notion of unity, how could he adapt himself to the alteration from this idea to that of ceaseless flux? The law of status was going, the law of contract was coming. The environment, which had once made a universal empire and a universal Church necessary, now made both an absolute impossibility. Man was no longer immutable, but mutable; one empire was replaced by many nations. In its essence the Reformation was individualistic, and by consequence nationalistic. The centre of gravity was shifting from cosmopolitanism to nationalism. It is pathetic to note that More failed to perceive this momentous change, while Henry VIII. saw its signs. The noble-minded judge was fighting for an effete medievalism, but his egotistic master proved the friend of progress. The tragedy of More's life —it was the tragedy of so many lives of the scholars of the Renaissance—was that he builded not better but *other* than he knew, and set in motion forces whose outcome was destined to fill him with horror.

Law always lags behind public opinion, and the gap between the two was indefinitely widened in the early part of the sixteenth century because of the concentration and the acceleration of the forces of revolution. The Chancery Court, when it sentenced Bilney, Tewkesbury, Bayfield, and Bainham to their terrible death, draped the scaffold for the Lord Chancellor himself. Another law court, the *Parlement* of Paris, when it refused to register Turgot's edict regarding the *corvée*, opened the prison door through which the aristocracy of France passed to the guillotine. More's court endeavoured

to control the new individualism, and in so endeavouring created intense feeling leading to the awful persecution of the years to come.

The Christians were few in the reign of Nero, and were comparatively numerous in that of Diocletian. The *Politiques* of the sixteenth century would have approved of persecution in the former instance and condemned it in the latter, because the cost of extirpating heresy under Diocletian would have been excessive. More agreed with Burke that 'Circumstances ' (which some gentlemen pass for nothing) give in reality 'to every political principle its distinguishing colour and 'discriminating effect.' * In view of the altered circumstances More would have persecuted in both instances. The transformation wrought in him can be clearly seen in his relations to the censorship of books. Caxton did not venture to print a Bible in the vernacular because Wycliffe's translation was forbidden.

'On account of the penalties [remarks Sir Thomas] ordered by Archbishop Arundel's constitution, though the old translations that were before Wycliffe's days remained lawful and were in some folk's hands, yet he thought no printer would likely be so hot to put any Bible in print at his own charge, and then hang upon a doubtful trial whether the first translation was made before Wycliffe's days or since. For if it were made by Wycliffe, it must be approved before the printing.'

The dilemma was awkward, and Caxton avoided it by not publishing the Bible in the vernacular.

The 'Index Librorum Prohibitorum' in England was established in 1526, thus preceding the first Index on the Continent by twenty-five years and that of Rome by thirty-three. On March 7, 1528, Tunstall, Bishop of London, gave More the privilege of reading heretical works in order that he might confute them. The following year appeared 'The 'Dialogue.' In it More departs from his tolerant principles, though he admits that in ancient times heretics were not punished till they became violent themselves. He attacks fiercely the heresies of Luther, which he plainly regards not as an error but as a crime. He vindicates the burning of heretics, 'and showeth also that the clergy doth not procure it,

* Reflections on the French Revolution.

'but only the good and politic provision of the temporalty.' Traces, however, of his Utopian belief remain:

'For [he urges] in case the Turks, Saracens and Paynims, would suffer the faith of Christ to be peaceably preached among them, and that we Christian men should therefore suffer in likewise all their sects to be preached among us, and violence taken away by assent on both sides, I nothing mistrust that the faith of Christ should much more increase than decay.'

In chapter xv his present conviction makes him declare 'that princes be bounden to punish heretics, and that fair 'handling helpeth little with many of them.'

Tyndale at once issued 'An Answer to Sir Thomas More's 'Dialogue,' and in 1532 appeared 'The Confutation of Tyn-'dale's Answer' in a portly volume of 326 pages. The progress of Lutheranism is noted in the preface, which prays:

'our Lord send us now some years as plenteous of good corn as we have had some years of late plenteous of evil books. For they have grown so fast and sprung up so thick, full of pestilent errors and pernicious heresies, that they have infected and killed, I fear me, more silly simple souls than the famine of the dear years destroyed bodies.'

When the reformer becomes politician, swift is his fall from his ideal. The fate of Wycliffe, the fate of Savonarola, did not suffice to save More. From belief in toleration as a principle he came to regard it as an expedient, and then its results as a crime. Goethe says the condition of all greatness is devotion to an idea, and in this sense More was not great. The preface of 'The Confutation' affords melancholy proof of the transformation of the writer:

'Seeing the king's gracious promise in this point, I reckon that being his unworthy chancellor, it appertaineth to my part and duty to follow the example of his noble grace, and after my poor wit and learning with opening to his people the malice and poison of those pernicious books, to help as much as in me is, that his people abandon the contagion of all such pestilent writing, may be far from all infection, and thereby from all such punishment as following thereupon doth oftentimes rather serve to make others beware that are yet clear, than to cure and heal well those that are already infected; so hard is that carbuncle catching once a core, to be by any means well and surely cured. Howbeit God so worketh and sometimes it is. Toward the help whereof, or if haply it be incurable, then to the clean cutting out that part for infection of

the remnant am I, by mine office, in virtue of mine oath, right especially bounden.

'Wherefore I reckon myself deeply bounden to show you the peril of these books whereof the makers have such mischievous mind that they boast and glory when their ungracious writing bringeth any man to death. And yet make they semblance as though they were sorry for it. And then Tyndale crieth out upon the prelates and upon the temporal princes, and calleth them murderers and martyr-quellers, dissimuling that the cruel wretch with his wretched books, murdereth the man himself, while he giveth him the poison of his heresies, and thereby compelleth princes, by occasion of their incurable and contagious pestilence, to punish them according to justice by sore painful death, both for example and for infection of others.'

It is obvious that the More of the 'Utopia' is no longer the More of 'The Confutation' or of the coarse and scurrilous 'Vindicatio Henrici VIII. a calumniis Lutheri.' The 'Dialogue' proves that he had often attended the examination of heretics. As Lord Chancellor he swore 'to use all his power to destroy 'all manner of heresies.' It was a duty he discharged with zeal and with more mildness than Mr. Froude is willing to allow. As a judge he was obliged to enforce the statute De Haeretico Comburendo, and he cannot be held responsible for the law of the land. The stories of his cruelty to prisoners rest on the assertion of Foxe, and these seem to be untrustworthy. Mr. Froude urges that in the case of Thomas Philips and John Field the Chancellor was guilty of illegal action. Mr. Seebohm, however, has ably proved that the responsibility for Philips rests with the Bishop of London, and that the charge against Field was not heresy.

Henry VIII. had staked his all on the new Church Settlement, and the chief enemies of Church and State were the heretics who denied the Royal Supremacy. The English must accept one Church in one national State. The acknowledgment of Papal authority was therefore heresy to the former and treason to the latter. More was unable to follow this development of the king's policy, though in the 'Utopia' he had questioned the Divine institution of the Papacy. The way in which he paid the price for his refusal is one of our priceless heritages. When he first took office he nobly stipulated that he must 'first look to God, and after God to the king.' By the singular irony of history the persecutor of

the consciences of others died himself a martyr for the rights of conscience.

For a time More broke away from the spell of the past, the spell of custom, the spell of tradition, but in the end they proved too much for him. He was unable to understand to the very last that on the one hand the new tendencies at work were identifying the policy of Henry with that of the nation, while on the other the papacy was steadily becoming anti-national. The conciliar movement attested the truth of the change in one direction, while the Papal policy after the Council of Trent attested it in another.

King Utopus himself, though he saw the absurdity of one man compelling another by force to accept his own belief, saw also that if it came to civil strife the best and holiest of religions would be trodden under foot by the vainest and the most superstitious. It is in vain for Dr. Gairdner to plead this exception and to argue that it was *because* More was by nature so tolerant that he entertained such a strong dislike to heretics who, in acts and deeds as well as in words, were quite ready to outrage the most cherished beliefs of the community. Thomas Paine asserted that Burke bid men sorrow for the plumage of the bird when it was dying. 'Furibus, 'homicidis haereticisque molestus' ran the Chancellor's epitaph, but it is not the least of our misfortunes that he was troublesome to honourable men. Sir Thomas More recited the fifty-first psalm on the scaffold, but the very policy of this conscientious man drove many to use it in similar circumstances. Roland Taylor said it amid the flames of martyrdom, and was struck on the mouth for not saying it in Latin; just as the Roman Catholics, who would not betray Parsons the Jesuit, were ill-treated at their execution for not saying it in English. It may not be altogether without significance that the first verse of this very psalm supplied the 'neck verse' of medieval justice, and that it fell from the dying lips of one who was as much a martyr to medievalism as to conscience.

ROBERT H. MURRAY.

A YEAR'S OPERA

1. **La Musique en Russie.** By CÉSAR CUI. Paris: G. Fischbacher. 1880.
2. **Essai Historique sur la Musique en Russie.** By ARTHUR POUGIN. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher. 1904.
3. **Moussorgsky.** By M. D. CALVOCORESSI. Paris: Félix Alcan. 1911.
4. **Mozart's Operas.** By E. J. DENT. Chatto and Windus. 1913.

READERS of 'Crotchet Castle' may remember how Mr. Trillo was quoted by Lady Clarinda as maintaining that 'the sole end of all enlightened society was to get up a 'good opera,' and lamenting that 'wealth, genius, and energy 'were squandered upon other pursuits, to the neglect of this 'one great matter.' If Mr. Trillo had lived a couple of generations later than he did, he could still have lamented the absence in London of good opera, but being an Irishman he might have consoled himself by reflecting that in any case wealth, genius, and energy were squandered upon it, more particularly wealth and energy. Opera being regarded, now as then, by the majority of people as primarily a social entertainment, it is not usually in its direction that one looks for new or interesting music during the average season in London. The conditions which prevail at the stronghold, within the walls of which most of London's operas are given, make it practically impossible to get performances of such of the classics as have (or are supposed to have) only a limited appeal to a modern audience, or even of those which might be popular but which require a close *ensemble* and thoughtful stage management. As for quite new works, however important and however popular on the Continent, they are at Covent Garden seldom considered likely to conform to what is vaguely imagined to be the taste of the subscribers.

Gluck's 'Orfeo,' Mozart's 'Zauberflöte' and Verdi's 'Fal-'staff' are three obvious instances of old works which ought to be given, but are not, for one or other of the reasons suggested; while the list of more modern works might begin with Ravel's 'L'heure Espagnole' and Dukas's 'Ariane et Barbe-Bleue,'

and could be indefinitely extended. Gluck's 'Armida,' it is true, was down in the prospectus of Covent Garden issued before the last season opened, and so was Boito's 'Mefistofele;' but subsequent events proved corrective to optimists. 'Don 'Giovanni' was indeed revived, but no one could say that the performance showed signs of attempts to co-ordinate details into any kind of consistent and intelligible whole. Those who look to the music of the past for their pleasure had to be content on the German side with some good performances of the 'Ring,' mostly conducted by Nikisch, and (thanks to the fact that 1913 was the centenary of Wagner's birth) with the production of three of the early works as well as of 'Tristan.' For French and Italian opera they were offered 'Aïda,' 'Faust,' and the rest of the hackneyed repertory, which generally managed to draw full houses by the aid of star casts but not always without them. The presence of Saint-Saëns, who was in London for a festival commemorating the 75th year of his musical career, gave distinction to one of the performances of 'Samson et Dalila,' and the return of Caruso provided a momentary thrill in some of the older works which are associated in the memory of opera-goers with his triumphs in the past. As to the more modern works in the repertory, 'Pelléas et Mélisande' and 'Louise' have held their own; Wolf-Ferrari's 'Giojelli della Madonna' made some sensation for reasons connected with the story rather than with the music; and Humperdinck's 'Königskinder,' though hardly eventful enough for the general public, once more left a deep impression by its sincerity and pathos in spite of the ultra-Teutonic mysticism of certain episodes and the over-elaboration of the orchestral treatment of the last act. Of actual novelties there was nothing better than 'La Du Barry' by Camussi and 'Oberst Chabert' by von Waltershausen, each of them early works by quite young composers. The former opera is so entirely insignificant and so lacking in any sort of individual utterance that one can only wonder how it came to be accepted for production by the authorities; it had not even the theatrical effectiveness which helps to carry off a work with an audience often indifferent to the quality of the music in an opera. 'Oberst 'Chabert,' the libretto of which is a ridiculous travesty of one of Balzac's short stories, contained two moments of musical interest (one in the second act, one in the last) and several

indications that when the composer has ceased to imitate Richard Strauss he may develop an idiom of his own; but many of the scenes were quite unsuitable for musical treatment and the sentimentality of others, which were inserted under the mistaken idea of making the story effective for the stage, did not help to improve the work, though it was no doubt one of its chief causes of popularity in Germany. Charpentier's 'Julien,' the third new opera down for performance at Covent Garden, was not given at all, though it saw the light at the Opéra Comique in the first week of June.

As to Mr. Raymond Rôze's recent season of opera in English at Covent Garden, the chief good which has come out of it is the opportunity several young English musicians have had of gaining experience in conducting opera. Neither Mr. Hamilton Harty nor Mr. Frank Bridge nor Mr. Julius Harrison showed any special gifts in this direction, all three being accustomed only to symphonic music in the concert-room. But until opera is properly established in this country, both in London and the provinces, it is not to be expected that operatic conductors will be found ready-made when they are wanted for an occasion of this sort. Students of our established institutions are not taught even how to conduct a symphony, and for learning the practical technique of how to conduct an opera the only course open to them is to tour with a travelling company. That is how Sir Henry Wood and Mr. Landon Ronald, amongst others, acquired the rudiments of the art. We need not complain that Mr. Rôze's conductors were only learning their business: it will be more to the point to congratulate them on having the chance of trying their hands at conducting at all, even on such familiar material as 'Lohengrin,' 'Carmen,' and 'Faust.' Mr. Rôze's own opera, 'Joan of Arc,' it would be hardly worth while to take seriously, were it not for the ridiculous claims which the composer has made for it in his much-advertised manifesto. In this amazingly naïve and pretentious document he declares that he 'firmly believes that "Joan of Arc" will establish 'the English language in the position it should hold on the 'operatic stage once and for all.' Those who have heard it on the stage will be more inclined to say that such uniformly monotonous and nerveless music, written with little instinct for either musical or literary style, to an undramatic text

constantly interrupted by *tableaux vivants*, is an example once and for all of how not to write opera, English or other.

Serious lovers of music would have been without new works of any real interest last year if it had not been for Sir Joseph and Mr. Thomas Beecham. The former was responsible for a season of Russian opera and ballet at Drury Lane in the summer; the latter for a season of German opera and Russian ballet at Covent Garden in the early part of the year, and for some half-dozen performances of Strauss's 'Ariadne auf 'Naxos' later in the spring. Both of Mr. Beecham's undertakings, as far as the operatic side is concerned (and the ballets lie beyond the scope of this article), were in the nature of tributes to Richard Strauss. The only other German works which he produced were 'Tristan' and 'Die Meistersinger,' both of which were given in a rather slipshod way and with many signs of insufficient rehearsal. It seemed in fact as though Mr. Beecham were far less interested in them than in 'Elektra,' 'Salome,' and 'Der Rosenkavalier,' and expected his audience to be less interested too. The English public quite rightly identifies him with these operas by Strauss, for it was he who introduced them to London—'Der Rosenkavalier' two years after, and 'Elektra' one year after, the first performances in Dresden, while 'Ariadne' was given only seven months after its production at Stuttgart. This is quick work for London, which is usually accustomed to wait twenty years or so before making acquaintance with a new foreign opera of importance.

But even the production of 'Ariadne auf Naxos' had not the importance or, at any rate, the musical interest of the visit of the Russian company to Drury Lane with Moussorgsky's two operas, 'Boris Godounov' and 'Khovan-'stchina,' and Rimsky-Korsakov's 'Ivan le terrible.' For Strauss, since the days of 'Guntram'—which was little more than an essay in the Wagnerian style—has written all his operas, from 'Feuersnot' to 'Ariadne,' in what is practically the same operatic style, and all have been heard in London; whereas the operatic style of Moussorgsky and Rimsky-Korsakov was something quite new to us, and not a note of their music had ever before been heard upon the stage in this country. 'Ariadne' belongs to the same category of operas as 'Elektra,' but 'Boris Godounov' belongs to no

category with which London has hitherto been familiar. It was this complete newness of style which made such a profound impression in Paris when 'Boris Godounov' was given for the first time there in 1908—an impression which has been repeated in London, Monte Carlo, New York, and other capitals accustomed to swear allegiance mainly in the camps of Wagner, Verdi, and Puccini. Only one work, 'Pelléas 'et Mélisande,' has contained writing conceived on anything like the same principles as 'Boris Godounov,' and the resemblance is not the result of accident, for Debussy, at the impressionable age of seventeen, made a pilgrimage to Russia and later on, after leaving the Villa Médicis, where he had composed 'Le Printemps' and 'La Demoiselle Élue,' threw himself into the study of Russian music, and though not ceasing entirely to write like Grieg, began at once to apply Moussorgsky's methods of declamation to the French language. The result, however, was not the same, for Debussy carries on the musical thread by means of the orchestra, which comments on each situation as it passes, with rich though usually sombre colouring, while Moussorgsky, roughly speaking, makes the voice and the voice alone the medium of the musician's expression, giving the orchestra only just sufficient to make a bare support for the singers.

There are two senses in which Moussorgsky's and Rimsky-Korsakov's music may be said to be new. In the first place it is new to anyone born outside Russia in the way in which any expression of strong racial characteristics is bound to seem new to another race. It is much more than a question of nationality. The French and the Spanish, for instance, with their common Latin blood, naturally understand each other's ways of expression, and the music of both nations has for some years been modified by mutual contact and interaction; but Reger means as little to the typical Frenchman as Ravel to the typical German. A glance at the French papers in 1911, after the production of 'Der Rosenkavalier,' and at the German papers on the occasion of the festival of modern French music at Munich in the previous autumn, provided many piquant illustrations of the fundamental differences in racial taste in art between geographically close neighbours. In the case of the Russian composers generally, the fact that they are Slavs differentiates them from all other Europeans except the Czechs,

who are known to us in music mainly by the works of Smetana, the founder of the Bohemian school, and his pupil Dvořák. The chief feature which the Russians and these Bohemians have in common is the use of national folk-song. It is very strong in the case of Dvořák and Smetana, and most Russian composers, except Tchaikovsky and the Rubinsteins, have either collected or used their folk tunes, while even Tchaikovsky resorted to them occasionally. But besides the strong national flavour which the Russian music thus possesses there is a racial characteristic in it which is to be found in no other Western music. This racial characteristic is the use of Oriental phraseology. It is not merely that Oriental colouring is superimposed on an otherwise Western idiom; the way the actual phrases are shaped, the insistent repetition of single rhythms and the lightning changes of mood from childlike happiness to profound gloom, are all indications that Russia in music as well as in politics faces both East and West. All Russian composers do not show traces of Oriental feeling in their work: many of the more modern ones are influenced rather by Schumann, Brahms, Chopin, and other purely Western writers; but Glinka, the founder of the modern Russian school, does, and so do four out of the five men who banded themselves together to carry on Glinka's work.

And this brings us to the second way in which the music of Moussorgsky and Rimsky-Korsakov may be said to be new. It is new in so far as it is the result of a definitely organised protest against foreign, in favour of national, music. Moussorgsky and Rimsky-Korsakov were not alone in this campaign; Balakirev, Borodin, and Cui were their allies. The five men were known collectively as Mogoutchaïa—'the powerful group' or 'the Heap' ('la cohorte' or 'le cénacle' they were called in France), and their efforts were directed towards making known the vast stores of Russian folk-songs and protesting, by the example of their own writing, against the vocal methods of Italian singers and the whole tradition of Italian opera. For until Glinka wrote his opera 'La Vie pour le Tsar' practically all music in Russia was either Italian or French. Tsars and Empresses in the eighteenth century started the custom of introducing these foreign musicians to the court, and amongst those who not only wrote operas for St. Petersburg but actually lived there for a time were Galuppi,

Martini (not Padre Martini of Bologna, but Vicente Martin y Solar the Spaniard, who composed the opera 'Una cosa rara' from which Mozart took a quotation for Don Giovanni's supper-party), Paisiello, Sarti, Cimarosa, and Boildieu. The first opera set to a Russian text was composed only in 1755 by Ajara, an Italian, and his example was followed in the latter part of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries by other Italians. But, except for a few specimens of vaudevilles by Verstovsky, which became popular by their tunes and their Russian flavour, although their author was very much of an amateur, no really Russian opera was performed in Russia till the production in 1836 of Glinka's 'Vie pour le 'Tsar,' which was followed six years later by 'Rousslane et 'Ludmilla'; and even Glinka could not entirely throw off the influence of Bellini and Donizetti, any more than Chopin, his contemporary, could.

Dargomijsky succeeded Glinka, and made his first success in 1856 with 'La Roussalka' (the water-nymph Undine), in which lyrical tunes alternate with very carefully declaimed recitative. He followed this up with 'Le Convive de pierre' (a setting of Poushkin's version of the Don Giovanni legend), in which melodic recitative is employed consistently from beginning to end, his object being to attain 'the truth,' as he put it, 'by making the sound the direct translation 'of the word.' 'Le Convive de pierre' became in fact the keystone of the new Russian school, and was referred to as such by César Cui, who made himself the literary spokesman of the little group of pioneers by publishing a pamphlet, 'La musique en Russie,' in which he gave a *résumê* of the history of Russian music and set forth the aims and ideals of the 'Heap.' A few extracts from this pamphlet should make the theories which they advocated clear:

'Operatic music ought in itself to be true and beautiful music . . . it ought to have an intrinsic value, as absolute music, apart from the text. . . . Vocal music ought to be in perfect agreement with the sense of the words. . . . Seeing that texts vary, each of them having a meaning of its own, it is absolutely necessary that the musical side of an opera should in an intelligible way be appropriate to the text.'

This was, of course, a protest against the conventional Italian formulas which were used for all situations alike. Again:

'The musical development of an opera demands complete independence of preconceived forms and should depend only on the text or the situation on the stage . . . the music ought not to go on by itself and become detached from the text.'

This amounted to saying that no kind of symphonic development was to be permitted. Cui himself also denounced the use of duets, trios, or any kind of *ensemble* in so far as they were not necessitated by the exigencies of the drama, much in the same way as Wagner did; though Cui's opposition to the symphonic use of the orchestra and his own arrogance and narrow-mindedness led him to decry Wagner and all his works just as he decried Tchaikovsky, Rubinstein, and in fact anyone who did not happen to agree with his theories. He proceeds:

'The new Russian school aims at rendering in terms of music the character and the type of the figures on the stage with all possible distinctness, and at modelling, as it were, each phrase of a rôle in an individual and not a general mould; finally it would endeavour to characterise truthfully the historical epoch of the drama, and to reproduce poetically no less than with precision the local colour as well as the descriptive and picturesque aspects of the action.'

The means of obtaining 'truth' in the vocal phrases was to be the melodic recitative used by their predecessor Dargomijsky, which tried to make the musical sound the translation of the spoken word. Cui thus describes Dargomijsky's use of recitative:

'One will look in vain for those commonplaces, those conventional, uniform, tedious phrases, which any musician could easily improvise. In order to know how to give to each period and each phrase the musical sense best adapted to it, in order to find the melodic accent suited to each character, one must have specially developed capacities, and these Dargomijsky possessed. With him, all the words of the text, all the details of the drama, are merged and made of one piece with the music.'

The drama must condition the structure of the music, but the music must in itself be a living organism with a beauty of its own, and must not derive its vitality from the drama. That is, roughly, what it comes to.*

It might be supposed that with a manifesto like this to

* An opera being, as Mr. Dent points out, a superposition of a musical upon a non-musical drama.

live up to, the five members of the ' Heap ' would have become self-conscious and artificial. As a matter of fact they did not, for the reason that the system they formed responded to their emotional needs and was not merely a theoretical structure based on an intellectual idea. And for that matter they did not all carry out their principles in detail in the same way, for each of the composers had too much individuality of his own to let himself become simply one of a unanimous committee of five. Cui himself was the least original of them all. He was not even a pure Russian, being in fact French on his father's side, which helps to account for his choice of Heine, Victor Hugo, Jean Richepin, and Alexandre Dumas to provide him with libretti for his operas, while his friends were going to Poushkin, Gogol, Ostrovsky, and other national authors. But it is hardly likely that even with a Russian text to inspire him, and with all his theories and his conscientious employment of melodic recitative, he would have written more interesting operas than ' William Ratcliff ' or ' Angelo,' simply because he had not got it in him to write better music. He was never more than a composer of elegant trifles, a writer of ' Salonstücke ' for young ladies. Balakirev wrote no operas at all, being content to inspire his contemporaries to write them, and showing them how to do so by giving them lessons in musical analysis, orchestration, and counterpoint. Beautiful and melodious songs he wrote and picturesque orchestral pieces (' Thamar ' is one of the few that are known in London), but his chief function was to be the social and intellectual centre of the group of young nationalists. Borodin wrote only one opera, ' Prince Igor,' and that one a masterpiece, which was left unfinished at his death and was completed by Rimsky-Korsakov and Glazounov. Only the overture and the scene of the ballet with the Polovtsian dances and chorus have been given in London, but anyone who has been induced by hearing these tantalising fragments to study the rest of the opera will have seen at once—what indeed one can see in his songs—that Borodin is no adherent to the principles laid down in Cui's pamphlet. Songs, cavatinas, duets, marches, and choruses are introduced into the musical texture as single, individual numbers, and though there is a certain amount of carefully studied declamation introduced in the conventional way before the airs, there is no attempt to carry on the system

of melodic recitative for any length of time. In one of his letters Borodin refers to this point. 'From the dramatic 'point of view,' he says, 'I have always been in disagreement 'with many others. Recitative is neither in my nature 'nor in my character. Although certain connoisseurs declare 'that I do not manage it badly, I am more attracted by melody '—I am more and more drawn to finished concrete forms.'

That too is what Rimsky-Korsakov replied when someone contrasted the melodic character of one of his later operas with his employment of recitative earlier in his career: 'I've 'had enough of recitative—I can't stand it any longer.' He can be seen resorting to it in 'La nuit de Noël,' 'Servilia,' 'Mozart et Salieri' (which is written entirely in the idiom of the eighteenth century), and, to a certain extent, in 'Ivan 'le terrible' or 'La Pskovitaine' as the literal translation of the title runs. But his use of it is only partial, for, like Borodin, he had too strong a feeling for melody and too much symphonic sense to suppress his natural method of expression in obedience to a general resolution of the committee of five. Cui's dictum that 'the *motivs* which he distributes in his 'works are in many cases only the reflection of an impression 'produced on him by other people's music' is much more true of his own music than of Rismsky-Korsakov's, and his statement that in 'Ivan le terrible' we can see the composer 'trying to 'bring himself into line with the tendencies and principles 'of the new Russian school' gives a wrong impression. Rimsky-Korsakov did not try to write in accordance with one principle or another. He simply wrote as he felt; only he wavered between the symphonic and the realistic styles, dropping now into one now into another, his immense facility and his supreme command of technique enabling him to do either at will.

The extent to which Rimsky-Korsakov approaches Borodin in style rather than any other member of the 'Heap' cannot be fully appreciated without hearing a performance of 'Prince 'Igor,' which we hope M. Diaghilev's Russian Company will one day give us, as they have already produced it in Paris. That his aims and methods are very different from Moussorgsky's is, however, clear from the performance in the summer at Drury Lane of 'Ivan le terrible' between 'Boris Godounov' and 'Khovanstchina.' Moussorgsky, both

in his songs and in his operas, is a thoroughgoing realist, more thorough in fact than any Russian composer since Dargomijsky. Music, for him, was 'not an end in itself but 'a means of conversing with men,' and what he set before himself was not the attainment of beauty which, like the Post-Impressionists of the present day, he declared to be the aim only of those who are in a rudimentary stage of art, but the study of human beings both singly and in crowds. Certainly nothing more true to the demands of psychological probability, and at the same time more intensely musical in expression, could be conceived than the scene where Boris questions Schouisky and slowly wrings from him the story of the murder of Dimitri, which, though enabling him to dismiss from his mind the claims of the Pretender, the false Dimitri, ends by unhinging his reason as it drives in on his already morbid mind the terrors of the self-convicted murderer. Again, what could be more direct and vigorous and untheatrical than the shouts of the crowd in the coronation scene, or more vivid and yet essentially musical than the drunken song and chorus of the Streltsky in 'Khovanstchina'? This scene was actually omitted by Rimsky-Korsakov when he edited the opera and prepared it for the press after his friend Moussorgsky's death, on the grounds that it 'seemed feeble, especially from 'the musical point of view.' His own musical point of view may be inferred from his treatment in 'Ivan' of the scene where the tocsin sounds and the crowd assembles to welcome the Tsar, which makes as strong a contrast with Moussorgsky's realistic treatment of his crowds as the duet between Toutcha and Olga does with the duet between Boris and his little son. It is all the difference between a composer who thinks primarily of the music in itself, and one who thinks primarily of the right musical equivalent of the words. In 'La fille de neige' (Snégourotchka), which has also been given in Paris, and again in 'Mlada,' the essentially lyrical nature of Rimsky-Korsakov is even more evident; but this is not the place to push the comparison between the two men any further or to discuss the methods of editing, which Rimsky-Korsakov applied to his friend's works, and the heated controversy to which it has given rise amongst the partisans of both composers. Enough has been said to indicate the newness of the operas, which have only become known to London some half a century

after they were written, and to illustrate the fact that both here and in the other works of the school to which they belong the composers realised that the burden of emotional expression in an opera must be on the music and not on the drama.

Now that is precisely what is not realised by many modern composers in Italy, Germany, and France. To take examples only from what was given during last year in London: 'Pelléas et Mélisande' is a play with incidental music. The music, it is true, is exactly suited to the situations, and is in fact so entirely in harmony with what is passing on the stage that it is difficult to realise that drama and music are two separate entities created at different times by two different men; but for all that, it is on the drama and the spoken word that emphasis is laid. When the words are not caught by the listener the moment passes by unnoticed. In the Russian operas every moment seems significant although the words must be unintelligible to more than nine-tenths of the audience. As for Italian opera, ever since 'Tosca' pointed the way, composers have come to rely more and more on the drama, until they seem to have lost sight, as Puccini himself has never done, of the possibilities of the music, and we have a work like 'Giojelli della Madonna,' which simply exists for the sake of the story and in which the most obvious chances of illuminating the drama by musical means are missed. For instance, when Maliella puts on her head the crown of jewels, which Gennaro has committed sacrilege to obtain, the music indicates no kind of emotional climax whatever. Again, when she gives herself mechanically to Gennaro while she is still in a kind of trance, spell-bound by her memory of Rafaele's kisses, the music does nothing to indicate what is in her mind until twelve bars before the end, just as the curtain is ready to fall, when an echo of the Camorrist's motive is heard. The incident therefore merely looks like one of the conventional operatic rapes, and cannot in fact look like anything else, unless one has a previous knowledge of what the librettist has to go to the trouble of explaining in a lengthy stage direction.

It is the same with Strauss. He is too much inclined simply to take the text with which Hugo von Hofmannsthal provides him, and to set it to music without considering the musical as distinct from the dramatic opportunities of the

play. He constantly makes the music only incidental to the drama instead of giving it an independent life of its own, what Cui called 'an intrinsic value, as absolute music, 'apart from the text.' He misses his opportunities—that is to say, as an operatic composer—and instead of taking the dramatic action as a starting-point for musical expression, ties himself to it as a more or less literal commentator. This is particularly the case in 'Salome,' where, except for two short symphonic interludes, which serve to give the Prophet time to leave and return to his cistern, the play goes straight ahead without interruption from the music. So in 'Elektra,' when search is being made for the axe with which to kill Klytemnestra, and again at the moment of the recognition of Orestes by his sister (to take only two instances), the emotional significance of the situation is lost and we have to be content with fussy and meaningless 'busyness' in the orchestra. 'Der Rosenkavalier' and 'Ariadne' are in this respect far more musical. In listening to them we do often feel that the musician has taken his raw material from the dramatist and worked it up into a new creation of his own, but in 'Salome' the music never seems to justify itself as a separate entity. The musician, in fact, is reduced to the level of the lime-light man and the stage-carpenter. He merely contributes his share to the framework in which the play is set and to the machinery which carries it forward.

Now, it might be argued that this method would be a good means of setting off and heightening the situations on the stage and also perhaps of emphasising whatever beauties the text might contain. But the argument is not valid, for the emotional appeal of music is so much stronger than that of any stage action that, so long as they are simultaneous, it is the music, and not the action, which grips the audience's attention. The music imposes its tyranny on the listener so much more emphatically than either the action or the words, that, if it is not made to carry the emotional weight of the situations on its own shoulders, it only stands between the listener and the drama; and the better the drama the more the listener resents the intrusion of the music. It is the same with the words. Gluck long ago pointed out that it is useless for a librettist to aim at verbal beauties in his text, and that all the poet can do is to give beautiful ideas for which the

musician must find the appropriate emotional expression. Other things being equal, a good text is obviously better than a poor one, but the success even of such operas as Verdi's 'Otello' and 'Falstaff' (of which an admirable performance was quite recently given by the students of the Royal College of Music) is due not to the share which Shakespeare and Boito have had in the text, but to the composer's instinct for seeing the musical value of each situation and his gift for emphasising the emotions underlying the poet's ideas.

Many attempts have been made to solve the problem of words and music. There are the numerous examples of 'melodrama' left by composers from Benda and Jean-Jacques Rousseau down to those of the present day, in which the speaking voice is combined with music. But no one can have heard even such masterpieces as Schumann's 'Haideknabe,' or the early version of Humperdinck's 'Königskinder,' without wishing to disintegrate the two elements and to hear each separately. The two elements are in fact irreconcilable when presented in this way, because each belongs to a different world and is governed by different laws. Debussy has tried to solve the problem by making the vocal phrases so closely follow the natural inflexions of the speaking voice that they merely add emphasis to the words, and seem to form a single entity with them against the orchestra which supplies a coloured harmonic background for the acting. But so long as the voice is used not for realistic but for musical purposes, it will outweigh the rest of the orchestra, because it is by far the most personal and the most perfect of all the instruments we possess.

Now Strauss does not eliminate the voice for musical purposes as Debussy does; nor, like Moussorgsky, does he let it carry the whole weight of the musical phrase; nor again does he balance voice and orchestra against one another on equal terms like Mozart. Sometimes he ignores the voice and sometimes he emphasises it. He does not ignore it, as Wagner ignores it in such a place as the Liebestod, where the orchestra carries the weight of the melody and the texture is so rich that the voice has practically nothing to add to the *ensemble*. He ignores it by giving it unemphatic and unvocal phrases to declaim, and then he smothers it with the orchestra. 'Salome' contains hardly a single vocal phrase as such, except the theme

allotted to the Baptist. This is emphatic enough, and, like some of the vocal themes which are much emphasised in 'Elektra' and 'Ariadne,' is utterly commonplace and vulgar. This thematic vulgarisation, as soon as the theme is vocal, is characteristic of all Strauss's operas. None of the tunes in his purely orchestral music, except perhaps the subject of the new 'Festliches Praeludium,' is so essentially the lineal offspring of the worst kind of German male-voice quartet as the Baptist's theme in 'Salome,' Chrysothemis's theme in 'Elektra,' and the tune in D flat in the trio at the end of 'Ariadne.' It is to be noticed also that in 'Elektra' Strauss ignores the voice less than in 'Salome'; and in 'Der Rosenkavalier' and 'Ariadne' he pays still greater attention to it. Zerbinetta's florid air contains poor *coloratura* and shows little sense of style, but it is at any rate designed to be emphatically vocal, and so is the whole of the last section of the opera. Much of his best music is to be found in 'Der Rosenkavalier,' and the fact, that the two concerted numbers which are vocally most effective bring the opera to an end, emphasises the change in the composer's point of view since the days of 'Salome.'

One of the weaknesses of 'Der Rosenkavalier' is the unsatisfactory character of the libretto, which alternates between sentimental comedy and rough-and-tumble farce, the farce interrupting the comedy to such an extent that the main character in the first act—the Princess—completely disappears until the very end of the opera, when she has been forgotten and when her return is felt as an intrusion. 'Ariadne' too is unsatisfactory in this way as an opera, or rather as a mixture of two operas, for nothing is gained by Strauss's method of giving the two together, and a good deal is lost. The combination of a romantic opera beginning on a tragic note with an episode from the Comedy of Masks might have been made quite interesting. The tragedy might have become more tragic if the light-hearted comedians had held the stage simultaneously with Ariadne; or the comedy might have been made more frivolous by contrast with the solitary figure behind; or some quite new and unbelievable world, where the fantastic and the baroque alone had a right to reign, might have been created by blending the two sets of characters with delicacy and imagination. As it was, the story of Ariadne and the play of the comedians did not blend or really overlap to any purpose;

they only alternated, and the result was neither one thing nor the other, neither romance nor fantastic comedy, neither tragedy nor farce, but only dull confusion of two apparently irreconcilable elements. The music too was a confusion of two styles—Strauss's own heavy romantic way of writing, which was at its best in the final duet, and a would-be eighteenth-century idiom, which, like the attempt to recapture the Viennese atmosphere in 'Der Rosenkavalier,' illustrates the danger of coquetting with the antique. The modern writing sounds at least spontaneous and sincere; the other is essentially Wardour Street music with '1870' and not '1780' showing through its veneer. M. Jourdain, too, is quite an irrelevant figure. He only interrupts the opera by occasional asides (the purport of which was changed in the English version), and might very well have been omitted altogether in favour of a footnote, giving reasons (of which several occur to one) for getting two operas of the sort over in half the time they would require if taken separately.

But the important characteristics of both these later operas are the attention which Strauss gives to the voice and his recognition of the claims of music to be treated at least on terms of equality with the drama. In so far as this is so, he is moving towards the main conclusion to which Cui and his fellow Russians came in considering the operatic problem, the conclusion which Rimsky-Korsakov formulated in a single sentence when he said that 'an opera is above all things a musical 'work.' Stated in these terms the proposition seems too obvious to be contradicted. That its truth needs nevertheless from time to time to be impressed upon composers, as well as audiences, may be inferred from the foregoing brief survey of some of the various types of opera that have prevailed during the last fifty years.

LAWRENCE HAWARD.

THE RENAISSANCE OF DANCING

1. **The Russian Ballet.** By A. E. Johnson. Constable. 1913.
2. **The Art of Nijinski.** By Geoffrey Whitworth. Chatto and Windus. 1913.
3. **Modern Dancing and Dancers.** By J. E. Crawford Flitch. Grant Richards. 1911.

TO the average Anglo-Saxon dancing is an amusement, either a spectacular entertainment at which the interest is more often concentrated upon the personal charms of the performers than upon their skill, or a ballroom gathering which suggests an agreeable combination of music and colour, of shady corners and pleasant meetings. To some people it is a puerile diversion merely worthy of contempt; to others a grossly immoral proceeding deserving of utter reprobation. The possibility of its being a serious form of art, requiring a long and arduous apprenticeship and meriting careful and critical comprehension, is a fact appreciated by a minority. Dancing as an integral part of life, an essential factor in religion, as one of the major arts expressive and interpretative, as a valuable educational training, is at the present day hardly conceivable.

The majority of the public have long been content to tolerate its appearance as an inevitable but somewhat uninteresting part of a pantomime, or as one of the less attractive items of a music-hall programme. There is, of course, at times a *furore* for some particular dancer; and the mass of colour and movement of a good ballet, especially if reinforced by the more questionable charm of a troupe of high kickers, is a fairly certain attraction; but on the whole it must be allowed that the critical appreciation of dancing as an art is limited. Most men probably agree with Shelley's dictum, that every male dancer ought to be hamstrung for effeminacy; and it is by no means one of the least of the triumphs of M. Nijinski, of the Russian Ballet, and M. Mordkin at the Palace Theatre, that they have demonstrated the fact that a man can dance without being necessarily effeminate or ridiculous.

The ballet has tended—in common, it must be allowed,

with other forms of entertainment—to make less and less demand upon intelligence and intellectual appreciation, and more and more upon the eye, by providing a simple sensuous impression of colour on movement. Gradually it has developed into a mere spectacular show, a gorgeous riot of beautiful dresses and faces, the chief interest and attraction of which has remarkably little to do with dancing. Vast sums of money are spent on scenery and dress, large bodies of women, of whom very few are really dancers, are marshalled on to the stage to perform a few more or less simple evolutions, and to compose a background for the performance of one or two favourites.

The dancing, however, which is now coming into fashion, and which seems likely to gain increasing favour, if not to effect a permanent influence, is something different. We are now asked to look upon dancing as an art, as an expression of emotional individuality to a degree, and in a way, to which we have not hitherto been accustomed. This revival has not only had a spontaneous origin in this country but has also come to us from both East and West. There is the renewed interest in the old English dances; the revolt against the limitation of the time-honoured waltz and polka in order to get freedom and interest into the ballroom; the advent of Miss Isadora Duncan from New York and Miss Maud Allan from the wilds of California, calling us to return to nature in the guise of the old Greek dances. From Russia, *via* Paris, where so much that is new in art and literature has arisen in recent years to stir the rest of Europe, have come Mme. Pavlova and M. Mordkin, and as a culmination the full Russian ballet.

The books at the head of this article—a further indication of the interest that is being aroused on all sides—make an opportune appearance. It is particularly valuable, when the air is so full of ideas and theories with regard to the dance, to have so sane and comprehensive a study of the art of stage dancing as that given by Mr. Crawford Flitch in 'Modern 'Dancing and Dancers.' All kinds of dancing that have been in vogue during recent years are fully treated. If we are not quite able to endorse the writer's prophecy that dancing is again to hold the place it held in the ancient world, we may well believe that we have in this movement an impetus that will raise the position of dancing—particularly the pantomimic dance—into the region of serious art.

The position which dancing holds among the most primitive races is an indication of its claim to be the earliest of the arts. In their development the arts have arisen, now from some spontaneous activity, now from utility. The spontaneous arts are earlier than the useful—since man was living and acting before he had begun to devise the useful accessories to help him to live more comfortably. Dancing in some crude form—the most spontaneous expression of feeling—must have been coeval with man.

The rude ceremonies, wild dances and shoutings, cruel initiations and sacrifices, in which savages indulge, are not so much deliberately planned performances as the natural repetitions of actions believed to be necessary for some purpose, or are mere spontaneous outbursts. By degrees, however, the various evolutions, grimaces, and gestures, becoming significant, are modified by a sense of their effect. Soon they cease to be a mere irresponsible outlet for passing feelings; they become intentionally expressive, and, when thus modified, begin to deserve the name of art.

Man requires this ordered scheme of rhythm to make his dancing effective. Many an animal can instinctively produce more beautiful and interesting movements than can man, who is not happy in this respect. Much training is required before his somewhat ungainly leapings and boundings become beautiful. Most dances, even among savages, are somewhat ridiculous, and even at the present time our society dances are so ugly, and so wanting in spectacular effect, that participation alone renders them tolerable. But in the days when man was nearer nature, when self-consciousness was less oppressive, when society held its sway more completely over the individual, he could lend himself more freely to take his place, as it were, in the pageant of the world. The dance subsequently became less a spontaneous vent for excitement, or a mere means of raising a pleasurable stirring of the emotions, than a form of social discipline. The sympathy of numbers in accentuating emotion is powerful; to tread the measure of a sacred dance, to move in some stately ceremonial, to act some form of dance and drama in unison, fills the soul with a deep emotion. This excitement, though out of all proportion to the needs of the moment, induces, by the display of art, an attitude of mind of great value in the production of a social sense.

The pleasure felt in such exercises would naturally lead to their presentation to any deities that the primitive mind had evolved. Gods, imagined as beings of like passions with men, would naturally be pleased with the things that delighted their worshippers. So the sacrifice of savoury meats would be accompanied by dances, and these would become the natural ceremonial of worship, and the emotions felt in the sympathetic excitement of concerted music and dance would prove beyond all question the presence of the divinity.

In analysing the state of mind which dancing produces, large allowance must be made for the pleasant glow of excitement caused by the excess of blood sent to the brain. The agreeable uniformity in the succession of muscular efforts, and the rhythmical period of their recurrence also play their part. The voice and the facial muscles, and many of the organs are affected at the same time, the result being a high state of vitality which may even reach to a kind of madness, such as we see in the case of the spinning dervishes, or in the ecstatic worship of Bacchus and Cybele. This kind of abnormal exaltation, by its power of suspending intellectual control, is of course apt to give full rein to the animal impulses. It is not unnatural, therefore, particularly among primitive tribes, to find a wild dance the accompaniment of, or prelude to, licentious orgies. But as the same results are found in connexion with the more highly emotional religious demonstrations, there is no need to condemn the dance too severely. The connexion between dancing and the emotion of sex, which has always tended to bring the dance under the ban of the moral reformer, is an interesting one. Certain biological analogies, such as the peculiar displays and antics of birds and animals at pairing time, suggest that in primitive times man may have advantageously utilised the power of song and dance to help his wooing. It is, however, unnecessary to look for such analogies. The strong emotional tension which accompanies courtship must have given rise to some method of outlet by movements of which we may assume dancing to be one ; such movements, when repeated, would, by association, suggest the pleasurable feelings with which they have been connected. Again, as the sex emotion is the strongest of all the feelings, any other rapture or excitement is apt to borrow its form of expression from this elementary

passion—generally, we may imagine, with complete unconciousness, as, for example, in the tendency to kiss and embrace upon the receipt of unexpected good news, or other pleasing excitement. But no doubt the most natural explanation lies in the weakening of self-control produced by the exhilarating excitement of the dance, when the strongest emotion will naturally be the first to make itself felt.

In early times dancing, inseparable from the display of strong feeling, became intimately connected with the important things of life. As part of religious ceremonial it acquired dignity and meaning; gestures, as they became stereotyped, conveyed definite ideas. The Egyptian and Indian dances were full of mystical significance, requiring for their understanding an intimate knowledge of the symbolism employed; but, on the other hand, the beautifully rhythmic movements of the dances of Greece have an effect that is universal. They are of all time, because they have their appeal directly to the senses, expressing the language of mood and emotion by pure grace of movement; they speak a tongue common to the world. In Greece rhythmic beauty of pose and movement reached its finest development. Everybody danced, and everybody appreciated, to a pitch never since approached, the beauty of the human form. The dance was at once the inspirer of art and inspired by the genius of the artist.

In the golden age of Greece the dance occupied a position of dignity and importance difficult for us to realise at the present day. But it is of great interest to note how closely the purity of the dance depends upon the general moral level. The Greeks were for a time able to keep their worship of the beauty of the human figure on a plane so high that they saw no harm in the freest exhibition of the nude form. Youths and maidens danced naked in the Gymnopaedia. The moment that the purity and austerity of their morals became relaxed this became impossible; and the gradually increasing licentiousness involved the dance and corrupted its purity.

In Rome, by the time of Cicero, the dance was not held in high repute, and the prevailing attitude is reflected in his remark 'Nemo saltat sobrius, nisi insanit.' This shows how far the change had gone since the time of Plato, who considered the dance so valuable a factor in elevating and

perfecting the character of the citizen that he wished it to be the particular care of the State to foster it in every way.

Among simple people with primitive virtues and strong moral feelings, the dance has always been marked by a strict and almost ceremonial character, but as soon as manners decay, the dance quickly becomes decadent. This art reflects too quickly and too faithfully the feelings of the people. No one would think of describing the dancing of the present day as reprehensible, or, except in rare instances, as improper; but there is no doubt that the dance does suffer from its identification at various periods with licentiousness and immorality.

We have already drawn attention to the weakening of self-control produced by the excitement of dancing. And it must also be remembered that if people have any tendency to immodesty the dance provides unusually favourable conditions for its display, and also unrivalled opportunities for working upon the feelings of the opposite sex. One cannot, therefore, be altogether surprised that puritanic feeling, however doubtful about the other arts, has never had the smallest hesitation in condemning dancing to the fullest extent of its power.

Whatever influence the imputation of immorality may have had in the past, it is clear that at the present time we must look further to account for the slight esteem in which the art of dancing is, or has until very recently, been held. Mr. Crawford Flitch finds the answer in the popular belief that dancing is less serious than the other arts. The view that it is less serious he traces to the fallacy that we are unconsciously apt to associate dancing with the ballroom and its surroundings —an amusement for our lighter hours, easily or comparatively easily learnt, and therefore unworthy of our serious attention. But, as he goes on to point out, there is really nothing in common between the dancing of the ballroom and the real art of dancing, which involves as long a training and as arduous and continuous practice as any of the other branches of art.

But, even given recognition of the serious study required to master the art of dancing, there is among many people a feeling that an art, which aims so entirely at the production of something merely pleasing for the moment, cannot really be a serious art. There is no doubt that we do take our art very seriously just now. We are by no means content merely

to ask our artists to create beauty: we ask them to give us some message, to expound a social problem, or solve a moral difficulty. We like it didactic, producing practical value. There is hardly a novel written, or a drama produced, that does not deal with some intricate moral question. The most popular picture at the Academy is the problem picture; beauty is disregarded altogether in frantic efforts to express meanings. Mr. Crawford Flitch, in an interesting passage, suggests that the present revival and development of the dance is a hint of a reaction against this tendency of latter-day art to usurp the function of the politician and social reformer.

The present renaissance of dancing has reached its fullest development in the performances of the Russian ballet produced by M. Diaghilev, which have had so marked a success during the past season. An admirable account of these performances is to be found in Mr. A. E. Johnson's 'Russian 'Ballet,' which will be a delightful souvenir to those who have seen them, and an attractive if somewhat tantalising description to those who have not. The book gives not merely an analysis of the plots and an impression of the dances, but a sane and discriminating estimate of their value and meaning as works of art. Possibly Mr. Johnson has not quite a sufficiently sympathetic appreciation of the more academic types of ballet; but his study and criticism of the latest development of the Russian ballet are interesting and convincing. The numerous drawings of M. René Bull add a delightful decoration to the book; particularly beautiful is the frontispiece illustrating Mme. Pavlova in a conventional ballet pose.

The theatrical ballet is a comparatively modern institution, though naturally it is the outcome of early customs and ceremonials. The Court ballets of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which arose out of the medieval mystery-plays, pageants, and masques, may be considered the immediate parents of the modern ballet. The earlier form was the opera ballet; gradually singing was omitted, and the wearing of masks abandoned. The heavy and cumbrous robes were next discarded, thus permitting freedom and opportunity for elaborating movements and steps.

England has never produced a great school of dancing, and

has thus always been largely dependent upon the supply of dancers from abroad. One result, therefore, of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars was to cut off the supply of dancers. However, in 1821 a determined effort was made to secure some of the leading stars of the Parisian ballet—by no means an easy task, as they had received their training in the State Academy, and so were unable to leave the country without the special permission of the Government. Negotiations were, however, successfully carried through, and in that year the *danseur* Albert and the *danseuse* Noblet were engaged at salaries of £1700 and £1500 respectively. Their reception seems to have been enthusiastic to a remarkable degree. Society could think of nothing but their dancing, and the reign of the ballet may be considered to have fairly begun. For the next quarter of a century, its position was unrivalled and supreme. The advent of Mme. Taglioni raised enthusiasm to its utmost limits. In the early Victorian era the ballet meets us at every turn. The surviving reputation of Grisi, Ellsler, and Cerito is in itself evidence of the widespread popularity of the ballet.

Taglioni was beyond question the most famous dancer of the nineteenth century, and must have been a wonderful artist; but how are we to compare her with the dancer of to-day? The art displayed by a dancer, like the voice of a great singer, becomes quickly but a memory. We can only form an opinion of relative merits by trying to weigh the enthusiasm of contemporaries. We have indeed no very clear idea of what the ballet itself was like at the time; but it is not improbable—as Mr. Johnson suggests in 'The Russian 'Ballet'—that it was the individual art, or skill, of the dancer that attracted the spectator, rather than the ballet itself in which she appeared. At all events, the ballet began to languish after the disappearance of Taglioni and the other great dancers of the time. Of those mentioned above, none were on the stage much after the middle of the century. In the absence of any dancer of genius, the tradition, though carried on with care, became lifeless. More and more importance became attached to mere skill and dexterity in executing difficult steps. The emphasis placed upon the *pointes*—dancing upon the tips of the toes—brought the performance perilously near a gymnastic feat. Although this step can be introduced with

great effect occasionally to give a suggestion of lightness, it becomes quickly wearisome to the spectator when made the apparent object of the whole performance.

The final blow was given by the production of the operas of Wagner and Berlioz; and with the arrival of Jenny Lind singing became the popular craze in place of dancing. In the seventies the ballet was driven from the Opera House, and found a refuge in the variety theatres that were then coming into existence. Although this necessitated certain changes, the production of ballets at the music-halls undoubtedly had much influence in attracting a class of audience which would not naturally have been found at the old variety shows. In speaking of the English ballet in recent times, full tribute must be paid to the production of the ballets at the Alhambra and the Empire such as 'Orfeo' and 'Don Juan,' and to the beautiful dancing of Mdlle. Adeline Genée—to whom English stage-dancing owes much of its recently reviving popularity.

In the meantime certain remarkable innovations were beginning to arouse fresh interest in dancing. Towards the close of the nineteenth century a wide-spreading movement was inaugurated by Miss Isadora Duncan. An American woman of remarkable personality and of wide activity, at one time desirous of initiating reforms in costume, hygiene, and morals, she finally came to concentrate her interest upon the dance.

'For her the dance is not merely the art which permits the spirit to express itself in movement; it is the base of a whole conception of life, a life flexible, harmonious, natural. In the development of the dance she found herself confronted by a dilemma. On the one hand was the limited technique of the ballet; on the other the unnatural contortions of the eccentric school. To return to the unconscious gestures of the people—that is to say, the crude, stereotyped gestures of the street—offered no way of escape. She found the solution in a return to the natural gesture of human life as represented in Greek art.'*

Miss Duncan undoubtedly showed great power in expressing the depth and subtlety of spiritual moods; but upon her appearance in New York she had to meet the ridicule that usually greets originality. However, upon coming to Europe

* Modern Dancing and Dancers, p. 105.

she soon gained recognition, captivating Berlin, Paris, St. Petersburg, and, to a less extent, London. Both in Germany and France the educational authorities were quick to recognise the possibilities of her system as a valuable training for children.

While to Miss Duncan must be given the credit of being the first to introduce the classical dance, it was Miss Maud Allan who succeeded in turning it into a popular enthusiasm. It is not intended to suggest that Miss Allan is a copyist: her art is truly original. It seems a case of the spirit of the times, causing, as so often happens, some new movement to start simultaneously in different places. Miss Allan treated the classical dance with a certain freedom and originality and with a personal touch that gave it a delightful charm. It was in the spring of 1908 that she first appeared in England at the Palace Theatre, and for the time carried London off its feet. Miss Allan's art is, so far as it goes, wonderfully complete; and in spite of many imitators has not yet been seriously rivalled. It is based more on music than on dancing in the ordinary sense, and tries to express not merely the rhythm of music but the melody and emotional content. Her interpretation of Mendelssohn's Spring Song was in its way perfect, and has not since been improved upon either by herself or by anyone else.

The use of the word 'natural' in describing this kind of dancing has tended to a belief that it can be successfully undertaken by anyone with good looks and a fine figure. For a time it seemed that anyone—especially if with some social backing—need only go on the stage with bare feet and a minimum of clothing to secure instant success as a dancer. Indeed, signs are not wanting that the classical dancer may, for this reason, follow the skirt dancer into obscurity. The idea that anyone can ignore the restrictions of technique, and be a great dancer by merely following the momentary inspiration, with the happy spontaneity of a child, is no doubt seductive; but it is fatal to dancing. It is not uncommon just now to see performers on the stage who, under the blessed name of Greek art, do little more than run and romp about; young creatures in flimsy classic drapery, picking imaginary roses and throwing and catching balls. This is certainly very often pretty and attractive, and it can be made use of as a quite admirable educational exercise, but it is not a serious

art. The art of classical, or, as it is often termed, 'natural,' dancing requires a long and arduous training; steps, movements, gestures, have to be elaborately studied. The perfect ease, which looks so simple and natural, can only be acquired by long and assiduous practice. There is here a natural analogy with the amateur impressionist painter, who, oblivious of the fact that the rapid, sketchy treatment which is so effective and looks so easy, is the result of prolonged study, thinks that he has only to be sketchy, slap-dash, and natural to be a great artist. Feeling is all-important, but it cannot be imparted until the language of the medium used for its expression has been thoroughly mastered.

Valuable educational developments have arisen out of this revival of classical dancing, and various schools have been started to teach it. Another interesting outcome has recently been seen in 'Eurhythmics,' of which M. Jacques Dalcroze has recently been giving attractive and interesting demonstrations. M. Dalcroze, a music-master, noticed that his students were able to sing more accurately if they were allowed to beat time with their own hands; there seemed to be an intimate relation between physical gesture and musical consciousness. This led him to the more careful study of rhythm, which of course is not merely the basis of music but of all art and indeed of life. By a series of physical movements and gestures the pupils became, as it were, endowed with a consciousness full of rhythmic melody, and thus able to express music as translated through their own emotions. The idea is that the individuality of the child is developed, and he is thus helped to realise himself. Without endorsing the somewhat extravagant claims made for the system, we can see that it would be a valuable training in control and development — a training which was, by the way, fully appreciated by the Greeks.

To Miss Maud Allan must also be given the credit of once more demonstrating how little the presence, or absence, of clothing has to do with essential decency. This question of clothing is very much a matter of custom and convention. A bathing dress is indecent in a ballroom, a ball gown in the streets. Our evening dress is horribly indecent to an Oriental, whose literature has to be heavily expurgated for our consumption. When Miss Maud Allan at first presented an art

in which attention was frankly called to the beauty of the form of the human body, as well as its movement, the spectator was bewildered, and inclined to be a little horrified, but as he found the performance, so far from being the fleshly, sensual thing the puritan considers dancing, was really a spiritual and poetical performance, he soon ceased to be even surprised.

If, however, to any one person can be given the credit of reviving interest in the higher art of dancing in this country, the palm must unquestionably be given to Mme. Pavlova, whose dancing at the Palace Theatre has been a revelation. A description of her art is an almost impossible achievement, unnecessary to those who have seen her, useless to those who have not.

'Art so nearly perfect as hers [says Mr. Johnson] permits of no analysis and stultifies all effort at exposition. Pavlova's sheer grace can never fail of appreciation. . . . Her superb mastery of technique, if nothing else, must command admiration. But it is her distinction that she delights not merely the eye but the intelligence; behind all that she does is the artist's instinct of selection and co-ordination.'

The Palace Theatre has the credit of providing the scene of Mme. Pavlova's triumphs, as well as of those of Miss Maud Allan. It is a significant fact, and one of good augury, that so much of the revived interest in this class of dancing has shown itself in the music-halls; for this means that it is not merely an artificially fostered society craze. The music-hall is in closer touch with average humanity and real life than the theatre, and if a thing appears there, and continues to appear there, it is evidence of a real popular want, and of a genuine widespread popular taste.

Mme. Pavlova, ably seconded by M. Mordkin, paved the way for the Russian ballet. Nevertheless M. Serge de Diaghilev deserves great credit, not only for his prescience in seeing that the psychological moment had come, but for his ability in carrying through the formidable undertaking of conveying to London a complete Russian ballet, drawn from the Imperial Ballet Corps of St. Petersburg.

The ballet in Russia had escaped the rather evil fortunes which had befallen it elsewhere. In that country it has always been fostered by the State, not merely as an exhibition of dancing alone, but equally for the music and the decorative

treatment. Consequently the ballet in Russia has never been to the same extent an opportunity for individual star performers, but rather a complete whole with a definite unity of purpose, to which the energies and abilities of all are duly subordinated. Thus when it appeared in full form at the Covent Garden Opera House in the summer of 1911, there was all the charm of novelty to add to its other attractions. The rapidity and completeness of its success are evidence of the widespread interest that had already been aroused in dancing.

M. Diaghilev was fortunate in securing the services of two remarkable men, and a large proportion of his success must be attributed to the incomparable dancing of M. Nijinski and to the originality and power of design of M. Léon Bakst. M. Nijinski is much more than a dancer; an artist of great genius and originality, he has broken away from convention and tradition, and in the later ballets designed and invented by himself with the assistance of M. Léon Bakst he has produced a new and challenging form of the art.

M. Nijinski was born in Warsaw, and is now about twenty-four years of age. Both his parents were closely connected with the ballet, his mother being a dancer. At the age of nine he showed such promise that he was enlisted as a scholar in the College of the Imperial Ballet at St. Petersburg. The training is long, severe, and thorough, and he there gained that complete mastery of technical skill which places him—judged by mere ability—in the very forefront of the Russian dancers. But there is in his dancing, as Mr. Whitworth, in his study 'The Art of Nijinski,' suggests:

'something altogether unique—an exotic quality which cannot be measured or referred to any standard of purely technical excellence. . . . Another fusion of qualities most noticeable in the art of Nijinski, and most rare, is that fusion of utter freedom of movement with unfailing sense of decorative effect. Freedom of movement can be obtained, no doubt, by practice. And a good "producer" may contrive that the main attitudes of a dance shall be correct in themselves and sufficiently beautiful. But with Nijinski, pose, attitude, seem to be an instinct rather than a lesson learnt, and even in the wildest orgy of motion his feeling for outline never fails. At any given moment his silhouette, could one descry it, would be found, I believe, to form a lovely pattern.'

The earlier ballets, such as 'Le Lac des Cygnes' arranged

by Petipa, 'Le Pavillon d'Armide,' and 'Les Sylphides' by Fokine, gave M. Nijinski full opportunity for displaying his powers in academic dancing, the result being very beautiful.

The next stage represents a series which are in a sense character studies of mood or feeling, such as 'Petrouchka,' 'Cléopâtre,' 'Scheherazade,' which enabled him to show his great powers of acting as well as dancing. It was 'Le Dieu 'Bleu' with its poses and gestures drawn from Hindoo art, as Mr. Johnson points out, that marked the transition to the later development. This became still more marked in 'L'Après-midi d'un Faune,' where natural grace of movement is replaced by an almost exasperatingly artificial form of gesture and pose.

The following description of this play by Mr. Johnson gives a good impression of the effect:

'When the curtain rises the faun is discovered recumbent upon the top of a low eminence. The latter merely projects sufficiently in front of the back-cloth to form a ledge, and does not detract from the flatness of the scene. One sees the creature sharply in profile, with head thrown back, playing idly on a long pipe. A bunch of grapes lies beside him, and between this and his woodland music he divides his attention. When he turns from one to the other his movements are quickly executed, so that a sharp profile is almost continuously presented to the spectator.

While the faun is thus engaged there appear upon the scene below him three nymphs, advancing slowly with sideways gait, knees slightly bent, heads turned in profile, open palms upraised to shoulders. To them enters a fourth running swiftly, but in the same sidelong manner, and preserving the same stilted attitude as she moves. Another party of three is added, and the whole group of seven stand rigidly posed below, and a short distance from, the faun's elevated retreat. They are garbed in flowing draperies, with hair dressed close and tightly bound with fillets, and as they stand stiffly, angularly posed, in an immobile row, they seem like figures detached from an antique bas-relief and propped before the footlights.

The pantomime, if such it can be called, between the nymphs and faun is quite impossible to describe. Such gesture as is sparingly used is strictly conventionalised, and the faces of the performers remain blankly expressionless. Nothing is allowed to detract from the stiff formality of their aspect. For all that the pantomime is curiously expressive. In his uncouth way, prompted by impulses only dimly comprehended, the faun seeks to woo the nymphs. They are startled and flee, but return almost as soon as they are gone, only to dart off again in sudden alarm. Curiosity alternates with shyness and fear. Only once are the quaint, indeed laughable,

angular movements varied, when the faun, with quite electrifying effect, makes a single bound into the air.'

The ballet had a great popular success, but largely this must be put down to curiosity to see the strange performance, and to the wonderful skill with which living dancers were made to suggest a frieze or bas-relief.

In 'Les Jeux' the change has been carried even further, and it can only be called a ballet for want of any other name. There is no regular dancing, except for a few leaps and runs; the performance really consists of a series of postures and a queer, stilted kind of pantomime. The plot is very slight. The curtain rises upon a garden with formal beds into which a large ball drops. A moment later a youth and two girls come in to look for it, but quickly forgetting their object they start a juvenile flirtation. Soon all three are rapidly forgetting their surroundings, when a second ball dropping in frightens them away. Mr. Whitworth finds more in it than a scene of charming dalliance between a young man and two young girls. 'It is flirtation in the abstract, the essence of delightful 'adolescence, clothed in the garments of to-day, but equally 'true of yesterday, to-morrow, and the day after.' However, he allows that in spite of its exquisiteness there is a certain experimental feeling about it which marks it still as the work of a period of transition. But he argues that the apparent oddness of a ballet like 'Les Jeux' is due not to perversity of subject, but to the employment of a dance-convention with which we do not happen to have been familiar. It is perhaps hardly to be wondered at if its reception was a kind of bewildered amusement. It was at first supposed that the strange angular and rectilinear movements, based upon an archaic type of Hellenic sculpture, which were introduced into the ballet, were simply intended to create the illusion of a particular period—just as in 'Cléopâtre,' where the movements were based upon the lines of Egyptian bas-reliefs. When, however, last year M. Nijinski produced 'Les Jeux,' a scene of modern life, and 'Le Sacre du Printemps,' a scene laid in early Muscovite times, both with the same curious, almost grotesque, gestures and poses, without any dancing in the usual sense of the term, it was recognised that he was definitely trying to introduce a new style, or aesthetic, of dancing. Mr. Whitworth, whose

evidently fine appreciation of dancing in his study of 'The Art of Nijinski' entitles his opinion to respect, finds in these ballets 'a gradual evolution towards a new expressiveness and a new 'technique.' But, interesting as these experiments are, one cannot help feeling very grave doubts as to their artistic value. It is indeed difficult to refrain from the obvious comparison with the claims, and the results, in certain recent developments in painting, broadly classed as Post-Impressionist. In the same way the writing on the subject is attractive, interesting, and hopeful; expectation is roused to a high pitch. But the concrete results of the whole movement are bewildering, and to the ordinary spectator ugly and meaningless, suggesting indeed a return to the primitive art of children and savages. It is of interest to note that Mr. Whitworth describes Nijinski as an ardent admirer of Gauguin.

Broadly speaking, there is in both cases a rebellion against convention and a desire to get back to a simple expressiveness. In the early days of dancing there was no line drawn between the dramatic and mimetic side, but in modern times there is no doubt as to the tendency to divorce them so that the pantomimists, taking over all that served to make the ballet expressive, acted but could not dance; while the dancer concentrated all his or her attention upon the intricacy and accurate performance of steps, caring little for the meaning and appropriateness of the dance. It is no doubt against this mere delight in form and skill for its own sake that M. Nijinski is rebelling; aiming once more at a fusion between the pantomime and the dance, to restore to the ballet its expressiveness; abandoning the mere pleasure of rhythm, form, and colour.

When considering this deliberately adopted later phrase of M. Nijinski's art, it is of particular interest to note how his perfect beauty of movement has been replaced by curious angular poses and archaic gestures. Just as the Post-Impressionist painter intentionally discards his skill in drawing and produces pictures with distorted outline, with face and limbs deliberately made impossible, in order to attain a result which may be expressive but is certainly not beautiful, so M. Nijinski offers us a performance in which the graceful movements he can command so well are replaced by these

quaint gestures ; and we miss the beauty, though it is in the pursuit of beauty that he offers it to us. He is genuinely convinced, as he has himself told us, that it is the way to a more beautiful art—'La grâce, la charme, le joli sont rangés 'tout autour du point central qu'est le beau. C'est pour le 'beau que je travaille.'* Just so with the post-impressionists there is a revolt against the surfeit of culture, a weariness of the accepted ideals of beauty, and an intense desire to put meaning into art, whatever it may cost.

It would seem, however, that M. Nijinski is falling into one of the many pitfalls that have already received the post-impressionist artist. He is trying to express in one medium things that belong to another branch of art. The sculptor in his bas-reliefs, the decorator in his frieze, can conventionalise, can omit, exaggerate here, diminish there ; he can deal with his material, he has to represent movement by a single pose suggestive of movement ; above all, by his power of selection and combination he can idealise the human figure, suggesting a beauty beyond that of any actual living body. The dancer, on the other hand, has to take the human form as it is, in the round, and the power he has in the rhythm of the ever-changing pose and movement is his medium of expression. In trying to treat the body as the sculptor treats it in bas-relief, the dancer is throwing away his best weapon to challenge comparison on ground where the sculptor is supreme. The result is unsatisfying and disturbing ; at the best it suggests a cinematograph worked slowly so that one pose—beautiful as that pose may be—passes with a jump into another position. Just so the post-impressionist painter tries to express in paint and drawing moods or feeling that only music with its freedom from precise expression can adequately represent.

When we look at the wholly delightful creations which M. Nijinski has given us in 'Le Carnaval,' 'Le Spectre de 'la Rose,' 'Les Sylphides,' 'Le Pavillon d'Armide,' and so on, it is difficult to avoid a feeling of regret for the later phases we have just been discussing, and more difficult still to believe that this is the road to the finer development of the art of dancing.

---

* The Art of Nijinski, p. 100.

To mention dancing at the moment without a reference to the Tango is impossible. The craze with which we are now overwhelmed is very much like that for the Polka, which carried all before it in the early forties of last century. *The Times* of those days wrote: 'Our private letters state politics are 'now for the moment superseded in public regard by the new 'and all-absorbing pursuit, the polka, . . . which embraces 'in its qualities the intimacy of the valse with the vivacity of 'the Irish jig.'

The Tango has had a somewhat mixed reception; its impropriety has been freely demonstrated by accounts of its lowly origin and dreadful associations. But this has really little to do with it; most dances have started from some lowly source before they reach the ballroom. Whatever the Tango may have been in its native haunts, there is little to be said against it as it is now taught and practised. The teachers of dancing have seen to the elimination of all taint of vulgarity, and with its hundred steps reduced to a manageable dozen it is now taking its place as an interesting variety in the society dance. Its source is still a matter of controversy. M. Richepin is reported to have traced it to the earliest times and connected it with the Pyrrhicha Saltatio. Another theory derives it from the Chica, an ancient and particularly unpleasant South American dance said to have come from the negroes. The more popular and likely view sees in the 'Argentine' Tango a variant of the old Spanish Tango danced by the cowboys of Cuba and other States of Latin America.* Thence it was brought to Paris, where it underwent a metamorphosis and emerged purged and purified, fit for the usage of polite society. What is of more interest than its history and origin is its astonishing popularity. A large part of this may fairly be put to the credit of Mme. Pavlova, M. Mordkin, Miss Duncan, Miss Allan, and others who have helped so greatly to bring about the present renaissance of dancing. The growing interest in watching good dancing has not unnaturally produced a desire for performance. The old dances were losing their charm, they were not particularly pleasing to the onlooker, and all life had gone out of the ballroom. Consequently something new was hailed with delight; the renewed interest provided the stimulus

* The Times, November 10, 1913.

to undertake the learning of the new steps ; ability to perform them aroused the envy of others, and quickly the craze spread. The writer in *The Times* referred to above makes an interesting and ingenious speculation that the craze for the Tango is part of our new sense of pageantry, and in support of his theory he instances the renewed vogue of fancy-dress balls and their tendency to more elaborate ornateness. No doubt this is but one more of the signs of the times, the tendency to break away from old tradition, to find some new way of doing things—better if possible, original at all costs—whether in painting, music,dancing, politics, social questions, philosophy, or religion. In this stir of feeling there is a chance that art may again get into touch with life and become expressive of general moods and aspirations instead of remaining an empty effort after technical dexterity, where the end is lost sight of in a glorification of the means. This new kind of dancing which we have been discussing is at once an indication of and a stimulus to a fresh means in at least one of the arts. Mr. Crawford Flitch expresses in an ecstatic chapter, at the close of his admirable and discriminating survey of modern dancing, his enthusiastic belief in the future of the dance :

' When the choregrapher of genius arrives, he will think in gestures, as the musician thinks in sound and the painter in mass and colour. And when he has realised the lavish abundance of his material, he will pour into it like a molten flood all that there is in the brimming life of our day to fire, to madden, to delight and to rive the heart.

Then it will be the time oft he other arts to look wonderingly upon this figure of the Dance, no longer straying timidly into their company, but coming upon divine feet with an assured mien and a mature grace, and each will borrow something from her untiring ecstasy.'

If we can hardly endorse this glowing forecast, we can at least consider it a healthy sign that the public should care, and care enthusiastically, for so notable an innovation upon lines that promise valuable and interesting developments.

FELIX CLAY.

CURRENT LITERATURE

1. **Studies in Modernism.** By the Rev. ALFRED FAWKES, M.A. Smith, Elder. 1913.
2. **Clio : A Muse, and other Essays, Literary and Pedestrian.** By GEORGE MACAULAY TREVELYAN. Longmans, Green. 1913.
3. **Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra : A Memoir.** By JAMES FITZ-MAURICE-KELLY, F.B.A. Oxford University Press. 1913.
4. **The Life of Francis Thompson.** By EVERARD MEYNELL. Burns and Oates. 1913.
5. **Twenty-five Years' Reminiscences.** By KATHARINE TYNAN (Mrs. H. A. Hinkson). Smith, Elder. 1913.
6. **Rustic Speech and Folk-Lore.** By ELIZABETH MARY WRIGHT. Oxford University Press. 1913.
7. **England's Parnassus.** Compiled by ROBERT ALLOT, 1600. Edited from the Original Text in the Bodleian Library, and compared with the two copies in the British Museum, by CHARLES CRAWFORD. Oxford University Press. 1913.
8. **Sādhanā : The Realisation of Life.** By RABINDRANATH TAGORE. Macmillan. 1913.

OF the fifteen essays contained in 'Studies in Modernism,' the larger proportion has appeared in the EDINBURGH REVIEW. Their range is a wide one. They are the outcome of a vast and exhaustive mass of reading, of many years' absorbed study of ideas, tendencies, events, of history in the making. Their composition has proceeded concurrently with a prolonged change of view in the mind of the author, for the earlier papers, he tells us, were written from the standpoint of a Roman Catholic, the later 'from a position of greater 'freedom.' And their publication occurs when the controversies of which they are a reflexion and explanation have come, as all controversies must, to an apparent pause, when the time is ripe for a consistent survey of loss and gain, of the past in relation to the present, and of the present as a forecast of what may be looked for in the immediate future. Mr. Fawkes's survey extends from Port Royal and its adversary, the Age of Reason, to a consideration of the urgent problems that beset the English Church of to-day. Representative figures

and personalities, Leo XIII. and Pius X., Father Tyrrell and M. Loisy, are submitted to a penetrating portraiture; novelists and men of letters—Zola, M. Faguet, M. Anatole France—whose achievements have directly or indirectly shed light upon a stormy sea of conflicting aims and ideals, are dissected with a searching precision, and the concluding essay wafts author and reader alike into the comparatively tranquil haven of 'The Ideas of Mrs. Humphry Ward.'

'To look on tempests and be never shaken' must be the difficult endeavour of a critic whose aim is truth and moderation. To infuse just so much of personal enthusiasm into his discourse as shall prove him human, and give life and edge to his conclusions, is no less essential if his work is to move the hearts as well as to bend the minds of his readers. Mr. Fawkes is a judicious partisan. He is scrupulously fair to the convictions, the virtues, and excellent intentions of his opponents, and so is free to give rein to his zeal on behalf of his own opinions. But justice is hardly more kindly than faint praise. And though Mr. Fawkes is too conscientious a thinker, too wise an apologist, to deal in exaggeration and invective, every page of his book shows clearly on which side he is fighting. David himself went out against Goliath not more convinced of the rightness of his cause than Mr. Fawkes is convinced of the necessity and the rightness of Modernism—a Modernism that 'is part of the European mind-movement,' not merely a protest against the Pope.

An individual, he remarks, at issue with an institution, civil or religious, seldom appears at his best; and even in these essays occasionally a bias finds sharper expression than is consistent with scrupulous fairness. Newman, as might perhaps have been expected, suffers most in this respect. Mr. Fawkes's instinctive inclination is to allow judgment to blossom into the warmest appreciation of 'the greatest 'Catholic divine of our generation,' of one of the most consummate advocates who ever lived, of that exquisitely sensitive personality, that master of stately, delicate, and impassioned prose; but duty sternly recalls him. He seems rather to belittle Newman by the very recognition of these great qualities, and at last coldly dismisses him as one of the leaders of a movement essentially sectarian, and the father of them that look back.

Indeed, though when the occasion demands it Mr. Fawkes can himself enjoy the privileges of the advocate, he seldom indulges his own or his reader's sensibilities. The tone of these essays is severely intellectual. They are not 'clothed 'in samite, mystic, wonderful.' They have, what Mr. Fawkes finds in Liberalism, a certain aridity. They show an almost fanatical distrust of all extremes. Their plea is for moderation, for flexibility. 'The days of an insti- 'tution which can no longer adapt itself to its environ- 'ment are numbered.' Change and decay are all around us, but they are necessary in a world wherein becoming rather than being is the essential condition of life, wherein perfection of enduring stability is impossible. 'The 'Church without spot or wrinkle is in heaven, not here.' Compromise, then, must be the watchword of those keen-sighted enough to see the folly and danger of fighting against terrestrial progress and evolution—compromise, diplomacy, and sound sense. An idealist would be as much out of place in the chair of St. Peter's as an archbishop 'of excessive saint- 'liness' would be undesirable at Lambeth. That Leo XIII., 'the cool and calculating tactician,' should have indeed believed himself to be God's representative on earth is nothing but a 'psychological paradox.' But Mr. Fawkes's sympathy is far rather with one who dreamed of a Rome the arbitrator of the world, than with the man of sentiment, 'opinionated 'but impulsive,' Pius IX. Mr. Fawkes can, at need, defend the quiet worldliness of the English Church in the eighteenth century. 'There was much less to do.' And the common-sense philanthropy of the Evangelicals seems to him to be a better thing than a Tractarianism more zealous than prudent. The Church is not an army, but mankind viewed from the religious standpoint—such was Loisy's answer to Rome's claim for the subordination of the individual to the community. And that is the standpoint of these essays.

Mr. Fawkes never declaims. His thought is perfectly lucid, sheds light rather than heat. He has one strong prejudice—against excess: he reiterates one warning—against impulsiveness and blind enthusiasm. His writing proceeds for the most part in a series of generalisations—often epigrammatic in turn—that build up the idea as stones form a turret. What he says of the critic to the manner born, that he deals

in irony rather than in denunciation, in suggestion rather than in direct assertion or denial, is in great measure true of his own work. His thinking, like the thinking of M. Faguet, is 'as nearly as possible pure brain-work.' Penetrated, like Montaigne, by the sense of relativity, his element is the mean. Such reading, uncoloured by the more garish tints of personality, unwarmed by any excess of feeling, is not easy. But every page of it is compounded of essentialised knowledge. Like a clear and detailed map of London, 'Essays in Modernism' delimits an immense and congested centre, with ideas, like highways and byways, leading out from it at all points of the compass into the great world without.

Mr. Trevelyan's first essay in 'Clio, a Muse' is a wise and witty appeal to the modern historian on behalf of the student of human nature, and therefore of Everyman. Once, says Mr. Trevelyan—and his once refers to a period so recent as that of the easily maligned mid-Victorians—history was a part of our national literature; now it is little else than the mutual conversation of scholars. The analogy of physical science has misled the latter-day historian. He has become a specialist. His chief aim, his coveted glory, is the discovery of new documents. He pursues facts for themselves rather than as evidence and manifestation of a universal humanity. His work is a record rather than an explanation. He dissects, he reveals the anatomy of times past. But the historian's true aim and ideal should be to make such dry bones live. For history, as Mr. Trevelyan sees it, is neither merely an art nor simply a science: it is both. Its functions are three: the scientific, wherein the historian is bound to be his own groping and fumbling Dry-as-Dust; the imaginative, when he makes his generalisations and arranges the complex evidence he has heaped up and collected together; the literary, which entails the presentation of that evidence in a form that shall arouse, attract, impress, and educate his readers. The historian must live back into the minds of the long dead, realise the endless motion and interchange of colour in time's kaleidoscope. And then his impressions must be recast, their truth warmed and illumined by his own temperament and recorded in lucid narrative. On this art of narrative in particular Mr. Trevelyan

insists. Without it history is dry and bare. To no man that ever lived was life a thin and disconnected procession of facts. Such a harking back to older methods, after the discipline of new, will not only restore history to literature, it will counteract 'the modern habit of reading mainly trash.'

To this wholesome argument Mr. Trevelyan brings the very gifts he would exact from his ideal historian. His writing is fresh, alert, alive. He can paint pictures and tell a tale. He is an independent thinker. One's own judgment, he asserts boldly, is the only one worth having. In those long walks which with so much gusto he describes in another essay—walks that delightfully conducted him twice round the coast-line of Devon and Cornwall, and for eight days together lost him to the world in the mist-wreathed solitudes of Pyrenean forests—he must have had ample time and opportunity to brood and reflect. His plea is for reality, for true freedom in life, in criticism, in poetry. He can sing the saga of the poets of revolt, but can still insist that, whenever the spirit of liberty can honestly exist without open rebellion, 'the truce 'of poetry' should be observed. For 'the best poetry should 'be the common ground of all creeds and of all parties.' He is, without insularity, with all urbanity and charm, English of the English, bold in speech and grave in judgment, 'To be 'a Briton means to speak your mind without fear.'

There must have been rejoicing in the land of twilight on April 23, 1616, for on that day Cervantes and Shakespeare joined the company of the immortals. Curiously in the gloom of Styx these dusty wayfarers, *vis-à-vis* upon the cross-benches, must have peered at each other, under the rhythmic stooping of the ferryman. Less than a week before, Cervantes had written the valedictory dedication of his last book. Then, his work done, 'with one foot in the stirrup,' this traveller, well acquainted with labour and sorrow, though he had barely attained to his three score years and ten, awaited even his most momentous journey. He was buried in the Convent of the Barefooted Trinitarian Nuns in Madrid, but no stone marks his grave. It is an astonishing fact that until this year no entirely trustworthy life of such a man should have been written, still more so that its accomplishment should have been reserved for an Englishman. Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly pays

ample acknowledgement to his authorities, to previous investigators, particularly to Navarrete, who published a life of Cervantes in 1819, and to Perez Pastor, whose recent researches have made the present volume practicable. None the less, this is the first attempt to discard all pleasing inventions, 'to sift guesses from facts, and to establish the facts by such 'evidence as might satisfy a legal tribunal.' The result is a narrative bare and clear, with many breaks in its continuity, in many crucial points still doubtful and obscure, and buttressed about with copious notes, left, alas! in their original Spanish. But in it we see Cervantes plain. We realise his extremely chequered environment, and follow a career as crowded with action, drama, and romance as the most exciting and fascinating story of adventure.

Authors for the most part live quiet and static lives. Their voyagings are of the imagination not of the flesh. A little love, a little poetry, a few wild hazards, a breath of fame, the inward tides of faith and hope, courage and despair, and over all the branches of Spring, the stars, the shifting, provocative shadow of Death—this is the sum of their existence. Cervantes was a man of affairs, a globe-trotter, a soldier, a poet, a picker-up of Fate's niggardly trifles. Thronged about by fellow creatures of all ranks and conditions, heart and soul one of them, he was a suffering, erring, substantial man in the world of the real. He never knew the blessings of absolute respectability, the dangerous shallows of ample means. He battled, pushed, sidled and edged his way through life. Hot with fever, he fought bravely on shipboard in the battle of Lepanto, till three gunshot wounds laid him low. For five years he languished in slavery at Algiers, each one of his four attempts to escape nearly resulting in the last escape of all. He served 'under Government,' was perpetually muddled over his accounts and more than once lodged in jail. He was constantly in want, even for food and clothes. He married a small heiress, nineteen years younger than himself. An intrigue brought him a daughter, Isabel de Saavedra. And that daughter's cloudy career involved him in endless complications, from which even Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelly's loyalty to greatness cannot free his hero without moral damage. Of almost every evil known to man he tasted in his time. Even the plagiarist stole his ideas and vilified their

rightful owner. His books at length brought him recognition, but never a full purse. Yet somehow or other, in this restless, troublesome, harried pilgrimage he found the peace of heart and quiet of mind to create the most lovable figure that ever vainly and valiantly tilted at windmills and fought for dream-begotten Dulcineas.

The impression that remains after reading Mr. Everard Meynell's life of his friend Francis Thompson is in most respects the reverse of all this. From his earliest days an unregretted solitude seems to have been the poet's destiny. He was a dreamer, a visionary in a world that more often than not resembled a nightmare—a child that became a man without really having known what it means to be a boy. Friends and masters of his youth all tell the same tale, describe his timid, shrinking, quiet ways, his absorption in books, his preternatural 'goodness.' All reality is the outcome of a kind of stratagem between the observer and the observed. Thompson, much more freely even than most poets, wreathed the world without with the coloured mists of the imagination. When, after many years, he saw again the home of his childhood, it seemed to him 'disappointingly like any other house.' And from one end of his life to the other his whole earthly existence must have seemed disappointingly like—earthly existence. He consistently failed in everything in which he had neither the hope nor the superfluous energy to succeed, though he succeeded beyond all hope in attaining his inmost desire. He had his chances of a 'career.' He failed to become a doctor, failed to remain a soldier, and when, with an Aeschylus and a Blake for invisible means of support, he ran away from home and hid himself in London, with 'a laugh 'readier than a girl's,' he would afterwards have confessed that he failed at selling matches and failed in putting up the shutters of a kindly and evangelistic cobbler. By now, opium was his most intimate friend and enemy. Often without food and lodging, he shared with London's derelicts the hospitality of the streets. As with De Quincey before him, his one peace and refuge was an even more hopeless outcast from the world's esteem than himself—'a brave, sad, lovingest, tender thing'!

> 'And of her own scant pittance did she give,
> That I might eat and live:
> Then fled, a swift, and trackless fugitive.'

In a rally from this wretchedness he put together the half-obliterated manuscript of 'Paganism: Old and New.' 'I came simultaneously to my last page and my last half-'penny: . . .' Was it a satirical fancy that selected for his essay's destination 'Merry England'? The manuscript was pigeon-holed, but after many weary months of waiting, the friend who was afterwards to be his lifelong counsellor and grateful literary godfather entered Thompson's life:

'Then the door opened, and a strange hand was thrust in. The door closed, but Thompson had not entered. Again it opened, again it shut. At the third attempt a waif of a man came in. No such figure had been looked for; more ragged and unkempt than the average beggar, with no shirt beneath his coat, and bare feet and broken shoes, he found my father at a loss for words. "You must have had access to many books when you wrote that essay" was what he said. "That," said Thompson, his shyness at once replaced by an acerbity that afterwards became one of the most familiar of his never-to-be-forgotten mannerisms, "that is precisely where the essay fails. . . ."'

Who could help rejoicing at that 'acerbity'? Even Mr. McMaster, Thompson's beneficent cobbler of Panton Street, tasted its bitterness when he tapped the dazed tramp on his shoulder and asked him 'Are you saved?' But there are no lessons in Thompson's life unless for the child of his own genius that may some day con its pages. This quarry of the Hound of Heaven never submitted himself to a less exalted chase. He sometimes warmed with a very human pride when recounting his blackest experiences. 'Wilfrid,' he once remarked, 'the Palace Court food is shocking.' What prosperity he knew as little domineered over his aloof spirit as his extremest desolation. This poet was never a model anything; not even a model lodger. 'I can sympathise 'with him, you know,' explained one of his landladies, 'having 'a son in the profession myself.' He was always behindhand, always eager to be punctual. In a newspaper office he found talking easier than writing. Never man apologised more urbanely and at such involved length. Simple things pleased him, simple things appalled. He was exquisitely sensitive. 'Oppressed with fatality, his sole sensuality was not to be in 'pain.' Like a soft-footed, courteous ghost, a ghost that can shine, and pun, and at need 'answer back,' considerate to all,

grateful for the smallest of kindnesses, but neither to bind nor to hold, he comes and goes in these pages. To such a man the world cannot be the familiar and homely place it is to those less at the mercy of extremes of feeling. He distrusted happiness. Rapture might visit him, but he never shared the quiet company of content. He knew 'the utter-'most of what love could be,' but it was fire, it was torture and pain, he said, 'the flaming sword which pricked man 'from Paradise must wave him back.' He could pour out his most secret and intimate thoughts for all the world to share who knew the countersign, but personal intercourse often found him stumbling and inarticulate, or trivial and tedious. Late in life came the worst affliction that a poet can experience —the fear that impulse and the gift of expression had forsaken him. And at best : 'For ever the songs I sing are sad With 'the songs I never sing.' The recognition of those whose praise was the truest understanding came at last. But Thompson never wrote a word merely to please or placate. His second volume of poems found less favour with the critics than his first, and was a complete failure in other respects. These things moved him only as midges vex the weary traveller. His real life was of the spirit, his real conflict that endless conflict between self and self. Mr. Meynell has not told his story as fully, perhaps, as he might have told it. He has served his own discretion. But he is nothing wanting in a sympathy that neither sweetens into sentiment and apologetics nor vapours into hyperbole. He recognises the weak no less clearly than the highest and rarest qualities of a friend to whom, in this Life, he has paid so distinctive and affectionate a tribute.

When, at the mature age of fourteen, Katharine Tynan bade farewell to the 'heavenly atmosphere' and the peaceful 'blushing' nuns of the convent school in Drogheda, it was with the tacit understanding that she would never dance 'fast dances,' never go to a theatre, nor read novels, and never, never look a male creature in the face. Alas! her 'Twenty-five Years' Reminiscences' prove that for a heart beating seven times seventy to the minute, a mind avid of experience, and an eye ranging from earth to heaven and helter-skelter back again, existence is a dance as fast as one

can foot it, a dramatic spectacle which keeps its footlights burning night and day, and its soundless green-rooms only for the sleeper who must await the blast of the last trump for his next cue; that scores of story-books (not to speak of reams of verse) demand to be written about it, and that it is crowded with men whom it is nothing but a vivid privilege to look gravely and fearlessly in the face. Celtic melancholy is a by-word of Anglo-Saxondom, but Celtic high spirits, zest, resiliency, are its unfailing antidote. The isle of the dirge is also the isle of the jig. Mrs. Hinkson's one obvious difficulty in this book was how to write quick enough. It is one long breathless reiteration of 'I remember'—the roses and woodbine of the cottage in Dublin, the bull in the orchard bellowing at her window, the hoops she used to wear, the elder sister who was but a brief, lovely vision, the forbidden horrors of 'The Mysteries of Paris' and 'The Family Herald' supped in the hay-smelling, dusty darkness of the loft over the stables, the 'bus that fell into the empty canal-lock and was lost with all hands, in spite of some bright Irishman's inspiration to open the lock-gates and so float it out!

But first and foremost to be celebrated with due renown is he who strides, laughs, and gobbles up oysters like a demi-god in the earlier chapters, the father whose courage was such that without a moment's hesitation he once climbed through the trap-door of a barn into an almost incredible complication of atrocities, for there, awaiting him, sat a naked maniac armed with a razor. He took his little girl aged five to wakes where the chief guest, with yellow, sharpened visage, lay for all to see (and to kiss), with pennies on his eyelids, a plate of salt on his breast, and snuff and tobacco at the foot of the bed. 'Come where my Child lies dreaming' ran the nuns' emendation of an old ditty: but corpses can be good Catholics, and to look *them* in the face is no danger to woman's immortal soul.

In those days—those middle 'seventies—poetry was being read by anybody who had pretensions to taste. Now we are less pretentious. For years this young girl roamed the fields and tasted many a summer's pride, reading and dreaming, marching home to the strains of Longfellow and Mrs. Browning. Then she began to write and to meet real live creatures-of-letters and poets in the flesh. Mr. Yeats was yet but preening his wings for his ascent into the zenith. 'Beautiful to look at,'

he lived, breathed, ate, drank, and slept poetry. Later the Wildes were visited, and the author of 'The Importance of 'Being Earnest,' 'a little like the poet Bunthorne, a little 'like Marat or Robespierre,' was breathlessly (and ruthlessly) observed beneath the effulgence of candles (flouting broad day beyond the shuttered drawing-room windows) arranged for this precise purpose by his mother. A wet desolate afternoon was spent at the gloomy house of the two old Misses Polidori in Torrington Square, with Christina Rossetti, whose skirts of iron-grey tweed and stout boots took her devotee 'some-'what aback.' 'I certainly believe she made the worst of 'herself, perhaps as a species of mortification.' But, as Miss Rossetti herself explained, she had written such doleful things in her youth that she felt obliged to be cheerful and robust in her old age. Another poet too, one with a watery eye, is well remembered, a poet who was also a small upholsterer and who fell a victim to an illicit passion for Liberty silk. Such are the perils of the aesthete.

But the real hero of Mrs. Hinkson's reminiscences, apart from her idolised father, is Charles Stewart Parnell. Though, as she confesses, she could not tell the time till she was twenty, she must have fallen into hero-worship as soon as she could see. The former is but a shift whereby to keep dull pace with the temporary, the latter is a symptom of perpetual youth. The later chapters are tumultuous, almost frenzied with the horrors and excitements and perils of the Land League. They burn with ardour for a forlorn cause, with unwavering loyalty to a lost leader. Ireland has at least escaped a wrong which, more desperately than any, would have wounded her femininely sensitive heart—she has never been ignored. Then, as now, Mrs. Hinkson insists that the racial bitterness was incredible. Yet she herself remembers only with enthusiasm, and records without rancour. She is just to foe and critical of friend, while remaining true to her instincts and convictions and her love of her country. It was not for the revival of old unhappy things that she set to writing these reminiscences. They are a-bubble with vivacity and romance. Now and then a ready pen endangers the soul of wit; here and there hero-worship forgets the rubric regarding the yet-alive; but such freedom makes gay reading and need break no bones.

The 'English Dialect Dictionary' enshrines for the use of one per cent. of its students thirteen hundred synonyms of the word fool, and there are more than a thousand with which to upbraid a slattern. The former may be anything from a goffeny goavey to a nornigig, the latter is unquestionably a slommocks and a wally-draigle. Every tiniest pig in a litter, even, has a hundred and twenty names to his christening. The squeaking squab is a true-born treseltrype. Literature dressed up in the latest mode in silk and satin is accustomed to look askance at these boldacious and fancical country cousins. Yet to a lover of true English, Mrs. Wright's learned and delightful volume on Rustic Speech is rich with music. ''Ow the birds bin singin' 'this mornin!' the reader may well exclaim; 'the coppy's 'all on a charm!' Her book appears at a moment, too, when the 'Society for Pure English' is in process of formation, one of whose worthy objects it will be to welcome homespun terms into high literary society, to expose this ignorant contempt, even to encourage the gifted amateur in feats of word-craft and neologisation. A living language is in sad straits when it becomes the passive prey of the grammarian and ceases to be the despair of the lexicographer. Every tome of Sir James Murray's gigantic undertaking bears witness to the incessancy of word-coinage. But back to the land we must go for words and phrases racy of the soil and encrusted with homely associations, words that are not mere bodiless spectres, but as expressive of the things they represent as a biggin is of a baby, its song of a blackbird.

For a while such terms will strike queerly on the ear: they will sound 'low.' So once did *budge, coax, sham,* and *quandary* to Dr. Johnson. Nor can more than a tithe of them be redeemed. Like the men who make and use them, words die a natural death. Not even the English Bible has saved *charger* (dish), *clout, cocker, leasing, magnifical, wist*; nor Shakespeare, *bolter, codger, inch-meal, melch, squinny, minikin, moble.* And all are worth a scatter of flowers upon their graves. But how gladly would one welcome every course of the ceremonious and otiose dinner to which one had been 'bidden,' discard one's decent black to don one's 'bravery'! Who would look twice at a blue Persian that possessed a British 'chintz,' who refuse the consolations of a hot-water bottle if proffered in the guise

of a 'piggy,' and who, unless mimpsey-pimpsey to the last degree, would hesitate to confess to a distaste for onions on the plea that 'they upraids me' and induce internal 'chunnerings'? Neither the East nor the West End can properly define a gentleman. To the Midlands we must go: there he is a fellow-creature that need not work. And the term is not confined to the less busy sex. Should such a supercilious idler listen to a chance acquaintance recounting a dream of how, after the crowner had obleedged his poor waughy body with a verdict, and the sexton had laid it darkling with a showl, his soul took its journey under a serene fleece of siller clouds, along an alablaster causey, sweet with laylock and nodding with apricocks unforboden to the pilgrim unafeared, his sneer would be the mark not, perhaps, of a cappernikious snool, but certainly of a too fastidious purist. For all these forms are of a wholesome stock. As for pronunciation, let the Cockney pause. There are, says Mrs. Wright, who has searched the land through, seven main groups of English dialects following clear phonological laws, and he who refuses to recognise *earth* as his *home* may pronounce each of these terms in four-and-forty different ways and be no less a patriot at the end of it.

But Mrs. Wright's book is not confined to Rustic Speech. It is reinforced and illustrated with a wealth of folk-lore—proverbs and graces, devils and ghosts (from Tankerabogus to Knockyboh), fairies ('a kind of fabled beings,' as Dr. Johnson defines them), and Derricks (from Nanny Button-cap of Yorkshire to Phynnodderee of the Isle of Man), physics and cure-alls, omens, portents, forebodings, fairs and feasts, charms and talismans. One thing alone is wanting—an index. Well indeed has she proved the truth of her quotation from 'The 'Great Frost of January.' It is a countryman of 1600 who speaks:

> 'We old men are old chronicles, and when our tongues go they are not clocks to tell only the time present, but large books unclasped; and our speeches, like leaves turned over and over, discover wonders that are long since past.'

An excellent kind of companion book to Mrs. Wright's is Mr. Charles Crawford's elaborate and scholarly edition of 'England's Parnassus,' the last of the nine anthologies and

dictionaries of quotations that were published between 1576 and 1600. It is not only a mine of sixteenth-century literary and poetical English, but, at a time when the Futurists are futuristically proclaiming a new Renaissance, it is interesting as an analysis of what subjects poets then found most ready to their mind and art, or at any rate, what Robert Allot, its happy-go-lucky and blundering editor, chose for the instruction and delectation of his readers. Excluding Mr. Anon and Company, fifty-five authors are represented in 'England's 'Parnassus' by 2223 extracts. In 'The Pageant of English 'Poetry' (1909), edited by Mr. R. M. Leonard, 300 authors contributed 1150 whole poems. A very rough comparison between these two volumes gives arresting results. Let a few instances serve. In the Pageant there are forty references under the heading of Children and Childhood, in Allot's Parnassus only five. Hell has no place in the former, it is six times represented in the latter. For Allot's nine remarks on Spring, Mr. Leonard has one short of thirty. 'Weather-'cocke' Woman has fallen from forty-seven, most of them unflattering—'Take away weaknesse, and take woman too,'—to twenty-one. Music has risen from five to twenty. There seems to be practically no mention of the Sea, Sailors, and kindred subjects in the Parnassus; the Pageant contains forty-two whole poems thus inspired. As for Love—on Love these time-severed anthologists are in concord. They squander it on their pages as Flora squanders daisies on a mead.

Mr. Tagore's 'Sādhanā' is a reflection and confirmation of the ideals which have been the inspiration of his poetry. It embodies to some extent several of the discourses which Mr. Tagore is in the habit of giving to his students in his school at Bolpur in Bengal, but for present purposes it is a kind of open letter, simple, critical, persuasive, addressed by the East to the West. It compares two antithetical views of human experience, two distinctive attitudes towards self, towards Nature, and towards 'the one Eternal Spirit.' Against the pride of our Western civilisation, exultantly enthroned amid its bricks and mortar, seeking by conquest to subdue the world, to heap up riches, Mr. Tagore sets the contemplative serenity, the self-suppression, the calm acceptance of pain, the lifelong effort to win to an inward peace, unity, and wisdom

practised by the wise men of the East. His hope, too, is to free from the mouldy trappings of erudition the mummied specimens we possess of Indian thought and religion. Things of the spirit are flowers of perpetual growth and changeless beauty. Truth fails no man. It is always a pure joy, a path to the eternal. Fact is nothing but a blind alley, leading only to itself. But though Mr. Tagore urges the necessity of a patient and isolated contemplativeness, of the one arduous quest, 'Know thine own Soul'—a piece of counsel often so glibly enunciated by the Poloniuses of life in the same breath with 'Put money in thy purse'—this is only as a discipline and means to an end, a discipline consisting not of an arrogant diet of nuts in the heart of the country, but of twelve long painful years in a wilderness that shall at last, it may be, blossom like the rose. And that end is a complete and happy union with the lives of others. Mr. Tagore's gospel is the gospel of love—'Love is the ultimate meaning of everything around 'us'; and of joy—'Pessimism is a form of mental dipsomania'; 'a thing is only completely our own when it is a joy to us.' Bank-notes and railway stations, love-letters in coloured inks, the man-cheapening of cannibalism—Mr. Tagore refuses no simile to enforce his doctrine. But again and again his illustrations are drawn from art and poetry. 'The artist 'who has a joy in the fulness of his artistic idea objectifies it 'and thus gains it more fully by holding it afar.' When man's work is the outcome of joy, the forms that it takes have the elements of immortality. Every word of a poem is essential to its idea, obeys a metrical law in an inner rhythmical freedom, so, 'the progress of the soul is like a perfect poem.' 'It moves in obedience to an infinite idea, which, once realised, 'makes all experience "full of meaning and joy."'

This philosophy is not strange to our minds, however remote it may be from our practice. Mr. Tagore weighs Western ideas in his balance and finds them wanting: he is a wise father gravely taking to book a wanton and headstrong son. The effect of his quiet, winning prose is to paint on his reader's consciousness, as it were, the serene, inscrutable smile on the face of an ancient and beautiful image, promising consolation to every vexed mind that can, however faintly, perceive the symbol of its peace.

WALTER DE LA MARE.

THE HONEY-BEE

'The birth and genius of the frugal bee,
I sing, Maecenas, and I sing to thee!'

1. **Bees and Wasps.** By O. H. LATTER. Cambridge: University Press. 1913.
2. **Die Biologie der Biene.** By Dr. HANS STADLER. Würtzburg: H. Stürtz. 1911.
3. **The Manipulation of the Wax Scales of the Honey Bee.** By D. B. CASTEEL. Bureau of Entomology, Circular 161. Washington: Government Printing Office. 1912.
4. **The Behaviour of the Honey Bee in Pollen Collecting.** By D. B. CASTEEL. Bureau of Entomology, Bulletin 121. Washington: Government Printing Office. 1912.

THE social life of the honey-bee (*Apis mellifica*) is more complex than that of any other animal save man, and in some respects the differentiation of the units which compose the society surpasses anything we can recognise in human economy. Among other bees and wasps the future of the race is wrapped up throughout the winter months in the body of one fertilised female; should she die, the particular race is at an end; but the honey-bee colony lives through the winter and is permanent, or at any rate potentially permanent. Although a 'queen' is cherished, the life of the hive is socialistic. No private property exists; 'all 'is the State's; the State provides for all.' In devotion to duty, in single-mindedness of purpose, in energy expended for others, in whole-hearted devotion to the welfare of the community which shelters her, the worker-bee is unique.

As everyone knows, the inhabitants of a hive comprise three ranks of bees. (i) The queen, as a rule but one at a time, is very literally the mother of her people, for she alone lays eggs; (ii) the workers, in structure females though—with rare exceptions—never laying eggs, but doing with tireless energy the whole work of the hive; (iii) the drones or males, absolutely useless except that amongst them will be found one—probably the strongest—who fertilises the queen-bee.

Let us consider for a brief space the activities of these varying ranks. A hive has swarmed—that is to say, a number of workers, together with a smaller number of drones and the existing queen, have left the hive and are hanging clustered together in a mass of moving insects, perhaps as small as a cricket ball, perhaps five feet in height and at its widest a foot or more in diameter. The swarm either finds a new home for itself in a hollow tree, or more usually is 'hived' by a bee-master in a skip. After cleaning out and if necessary smoothing the walls of their new home, the worker-bees immediately begin the formation of the new combs. An uppermost row of bees clasps the roof of the hive with their fore-legs supporting other rows below them until we find a living veil of bees hanging from the roof of the hive. All these bees are secreting wax on the wax-plates of their abdomens. To produce this they must previously have consumed much honey. Latter tells us that to produce 1 lb. of wax 15 lbs. of honey must be eaten. Fig. 2 shows how the wax-plates are disengaged from the abdomen and passed forward to be moulded by the mandibles.

FIG. 1.

HONEY-BEE. — A, Drone; B, Queen; C, Worker. (After Benton, Bulletin I. (n.s.) Div. Ent., U.S. Dept. Agric.) As in the Ency. Brit. 11th Edn.

Right and left of this veil of bees will be parallel veils engaged in forming other combs so accurately spaced that ultimately the empty plane between two finished combs is just wide enough to allow two bees to pass each other. The topmost row of bees, after kneading and moulding the wax with their jaws (mandibles), press it in a line along the roof to form a foundation for the comb. This of course is an upside-down foundation, for bees construct their comb from above downwards. More wax is then supplied by

the hanging bees below, and passed forward to the builders of the foundation. As soon as the foundation is secured, the living veil disintegrates and the constituent bees begin to work independently at the building of the comb. No bee or group of bees works at one cell or group of cells; always fresh workers are coming and fastening their mite of wax to one or the other part of the comb. All seems unorganised, undirected, confused and without guidance. There is no foreman builder; there is no experience, for many of the builders have scarcely emerged from the pupa stage for three days; there is no means even of seeing, for the inside of a hive is pitch dark. Yet the bees produce with machine-like rapidity and mathematical accuracy a cell so uniform in size that 'au 'moment de l'établissement du 'système décimal, lorsqu'on 'chercha dans la nature une 'mesure fixe qui pût servir de 'point de départ et d'étalon 'incontestable, Réaumur pro- 'posa l'alvéole de l'abeille.' *

FIG. 2

Ventral view of a worker bee in the act of removing a wax scale with its left hind leg. The two middle legs and the right hind leg are used for support. (Casteel.)

Bees, and wasps also, have learned that to obtain most space with the use of least material and consequently least labour, the columnar cells should be six-sided in cross-section. The vertical comb of bees consists of two layers of cells back to back. The bottom of each cell is a three-sided pyramid, just the shape that is seen when the eighth part of a cube is removed; on the six edges thus shown the six sides of the cell arise. The walls of the cells are not of uniform thickness; they become thinner as they near the mouth, which, however, has a thickened rim. These cells are all of one size and serve as the homes of the young workers and for the storing of the collected pollen and honey.

But after some weeks the inhabitants of the hive begin to

* Maeterlinck, 'La Vie des Abeilles,' p. 134.

think of rearing drones and queens. Appropriate cells for these are now prepared. The drone-cell has to accommodate a bigger larva than the worker-cell and is correspondingly bigger and about one-third deeper, but except in size the difference is negligible. Among wild honey-bees drone-cells are often placed in special drone-combs, but in the artificial hive these cells are intermingled with the worker-cells. The queen-bee cells, however, differ much more widely from the worker-cells. They are, to begin with, very few in number, usually four or five ; thirty seems almost to be a record in a flourishing colony. All trace of a six-sided column disappears ; the cell is cylindrical inside, but irregular and often marked with the scars of worker-cells outside. The cell is about the size of an acorn ; the wall is very stout, 2–3 mm. thick, and the mouth opens downwards. As a rule these queen-cells stand out from the under edge of the worker-comb, rarely are they found on the drone's comb. The worker-cells are used over and over again for successive breeds of these undeveloped females, and the same is true of the drone-cells ; but as soon as the young queen has emerged from the royal-cell it is broken up and the wax is carried off to be used elsewhere.

The ' middle-plate ' between the two layers of cells of one comb is separated from the ' middle-plate ' of the next comb by a space of 35 mm. The depth of each brood cell is 12·5 mm., and this leaves a space between each adjacent comb of 10 mm., room enough for the bees to pass back to back as they run over the open mouths of the cells tending the inmates. But since when filling or emptying the honey-cells there is no need for the bees to pass one another, the honey cells are deeper (16–17 mm.) and the space between them is consequently narrowed, and the bulky queen-bee cannot traverse it. The rate of growth of the comb depends on the rate of growth of the colony, and often it happens that the lower part is left in an incomplete state.

A young comb is white, translucent, very brittle, but it soon hardens and toughens. The larva housed in each cell before turning into the cocoon spins a silken sac. When she emerges from the cell as a perfect insect, she leaves this sac behind her, and although the vacated cell is at once and carefully cleaned out, this silken sac is suffered to remain, and so with each new occupant of the cell the number of sacs

increases, adding greatly to the strength of the comb. The cells of old combs—and combs are often years old—may contain dozens of these silken webs, and although each is of extreme tenuity their accumulated bulk often necessitates an enlargement of the cell if it is to accommodate further larvae. The cell-covers of the worker and drone brood-cells are convex and are easily distinguished from the flat caps of the honey-cells.

One of the constant cares of the ever-busy bee is that of keeping the comb in repair, and constant reparation is needed. Another duty is to keep it clean. As soon as a cell is empty, it is 'swept and garnished.' Dust, fungi, dead bees, old remains of food, the dejecta of the queen and of the drones, are all removed by the workers. In fact these indefatigable spinsters enjoy, as they deserve to do, a perpetual spring-cleaning, so dear to the female heart.

One other substance besides honey and pollen is brought by the workers into the hive, and that is the gummy, sticky exudation of certain trees—for instance, that of the horse-chestnut buds. This *propolis*, as it is called, is never stored in cells. It is used to stop crannies in the hive and so prevent draughts; sometimes it is plastered nearly all over the inner wall, and at other times invading snails or moths or even mice, which are too big for the bees to remove, find a sticky sepulture entombed in propolis within the hive:

> 'And with their stores of gather'd glue contrive
> To stop the rents and crannies of their hive.
> No bird-lime, no Idean pitch, produce
> A more tenacious mass of clammy juice.' *

An average hive will contain some 30,000 workers, 2000 drones and one queen, but in a strongly stocked community these numbers may be doubled or even trebled. The queen alone lays eggs and is a fully functional female; she is bigger than the worker and her abdomen is enlarged to accommodate her enormous ovary which pours forth a ceaseless flow of eggs. The hind legs of the queen are devoid of those modifications which enable the workers to collect and store the pollen; the wax glands again are reduced and apparently never used. The drone is the male; he is bigger than the

* Georgic IV.

workers and the queen, and is more stoutly built; his hairs are densely placed and short, his eyes are so large that they meet on the top of the head, the hind legs have no modifications for pollen-collecting, etc., the antennae have an extra joint; his hum is deeper and louder than that of the workers. He has altogether a stronger and more virile organism, and yet, with the sole exception of fertilising the queen, he does absolutely nothing helpful in the life of the hive.

When the queen moves on her egg-laying progress she first explores each empty cell with her antennae, putting her head deep into the cell; then turning round she clasps the edge of the cell with her hind legs and inserting her abdomen deposits a single egg in the centre floor of the cell. Then she passes on to the next cell, and never does she tire or in any circumstance miss a cell. During this progress she is accompanied by a small court of worker-bees who, as courtiers should do, walk backwards before her. Some of them are engaged in fanning the queen with their wings, others stroke or lick with their 'tongue' the royal thorax or abdomen, others feed her on their half-digested 'pap' or 'royal jelly,' and all are humming in a most soothing and comforting manner.

A young queen at the height of the season (May or June) lays some 2000–3500 eggs in the four-and-twenty hours. After the second year her fecundity is somewhat abated, but in the course of her four to five years' life she produces many hundred thousand ova. To show the meaning of this amazing power of metabolism, Dr. H. Stadler has calculated that 1 gram of bee flesh will yearly produce 110 grams of bee eggs! There is, however, a peculiar relation—quite inexplicable—between the state of the hive and the number of eggs laid. The latter varies with the strength of the community; if the number of the hive is in some way lowered, the egg-laying is intermitted. No egg is laid unless there are enough able-bodied workers to tend the resulting larva. In the tropics the activity of the hive does not vary all the year round, but in temperate climes the queen ceases laying in the autumn and retires into winter quarters, to recommence her task early in the following spring.

In the worker-cells and in the queen-cells the queen lays fertilised eggs; but in the drone-cells the eggs are, as far as is known, invariably unfertilised. The birth of the drone

or male bee may therefore be described as a case of parthenogenesis. What stimulus induces the reproductive organs of the queen to give the spermatozoa access to the egg in the former case, and to withhold it in the latter, is not understood. It can hardly be a matter of season, for the worker-eggs are laid at all times, the drones only when the swarming of the hive seems imminent, and the queen-eggs later than the drone. Neither can it be the stimulus of the variation in the size of the cell, for if all the large male-cells are removed, the queen will lay an unfertilised egg in a worker-cell, and conversely should the stock of worker-cells be exhausted she will lay worker-eggs in male-cells. The five or six queen-eggs laid in the spacious royal-cells are not laid simultaneously, but one after another at intervals of one or two days, and the resultant young queens emerge at similar intervals. This arrangement has an important bearing on the swarming of the hive.

As soon as an egg is laid the motherly instincts of those 'barren virgins' the worker-bees are aroused. They push their heads into the cell and apparently do something to the egg, though no one knows what. Within three days a minute white, maggot-like grub emerges and at once demands the attention of several workers. It is devoid of almost everything we associate with bees. It has no wings, no legs, no sting, no antennae, no eyes, no proboscis, no hairs, no hard chitinous cuticle, only one pair of salivary glands (not three) whose secretion hardens to form the cocoon; the alimentary canal ends blindly, and indeed the digestion of the small larva is so complete that there is no reason why it should end in any other way.

As soon as the larva has left the egg-shell the workers hurry up with a supply of nutriment. At first this consists of food which they themselves secrete from their salivary glands. It is known as 'pap' or 'royal jelly' and has a white or yellowish jelly-like appearance. The workers fill the cell with this food and the larva not only eagerly laps it into her mouth but probably absorbs this pabulum, in which she floats, through her tender skin. On the fourth day the worker-larva is partially weaned and her food is now mixed with honey; after the same period the drones are completely weaned and are fed henceforth entirely on honey and pollen.

The queen-larvae, on the other hand, are always fed on 'royal 'pap,' and consume great quantities of it, the roomy royal-cell being flooded with it. This food has an extraordinary effect on the future of the brood; if continuously given to a larva of the worker-class that larva will develop into a queen-bee; if continuously given to a drone-larva, the resultant drone will be of an enormous and monstrous growth but its testes will suffer a fatty degeneration and disappear.

After five and a half days the queen-larvae, and after six days the drone and worker-larvae, cease to feed. The worker-bees now close with a convex cap the cell which shelters the larva, and the entombed larva proceeds to secrete from its salivary glands a cocoon which fills the cell, except in the case of a royal-cell where the cocoon occupies about one-third of the space. Within this the larva becomes first a 'pronymph' and then a true pupa in which the body of the adult bee is being rebuilt from larval tissues. On the 'allotted day,' when the chitinous cuirass of the adult has to some extent hardened, the young bee is ready to leave her cell and commences to gnaw through the waxen cover of the cell, a task in which she is helped by numerous workers outside. Soon the way is cleared and she staggers forth into the darkness, heat, and bustle of the hive. Attendant workers wait upon her, arrange her dishevelled hairs, clean her, and offer her honey to eat. But she has undergone a resurrection, and is at first bewildered at the new world into which she has stepped, trembling and feeble. Soon, however, things settle down, her wings expand and harden, her legs lengthen, and without guidance, without experience, she in a short time is beating her wings and dancing over the cells now ready to open for the exit of her younger sisters. Both drones and workers require two days to become really active and capable of full power, but half a day suffices for the young queen.

Neither workers nor drones quit the hive till the sixth day after emergence, but the time of the workers is not wasted; hanging in motionless but living garlands, they secrete, from four pairs of 'pockets' situate on the under-side of the abdomen, eight plates of snow-white wax as light as foam; they also secrete the royal-jelly and with it feed the larvae; they carry to the 'honey-pots' the honey brought into the hive by older workers; they press with their heads into the

pollen-cells the pollen collected by their elders; they help the emerging bees into the outer darkness of the hive; they cleanse the vacated cells, and, standing in parallel rows, obliquely one behind another, they regulate by the fanning of their wings the ventilation of the hive and drive off the superfluous water in the 'nectar' until it obtains the consistency of honey. All this is done, and done well, without guidance and without practice.

Only after a week or eight days do our young workers venture into the light, and this great adventure is fearfully and timidly undertaken. Crossing the threshold, they attempt at first short flights, enlarging them each time, but never do they turn their head in any direction save that of their hive and home. During their first flight their tracheae—their breathing-tubes—are for the first time filled, and they now attain their normal figure. Soon, however, they return to resume their household duties, for, like Martha, they are 'cumbered about much serving.' Day by day, if the weather be favourable, these trial flights are resumed about noon, until the young workers are well orientated as to the position of their hive amongst surrounding objects; as a rule many of the younger bees and drones fly together, producing a veritable cloud of flying insects. After another eight or ten days the workers are strong enough to go in search of honey, pollen, water, or the sticky propolis.

Both colour and scent in the flowers attract the bees; their favourite hue is blue and certain purplish reds; then come in descending order, violet, red, white, and lastly yellow. When collecting the pollen, the bee hovers close to the flower and besprinkles the anthers with a little honey and saliva, then approaching the blossom she kneads the now moistened and sticky mass of pollen with her jaws, and finally packs it away in the baskets or *corbicula* on the outer surface of the tibia of the last pair of legs. But much pollen is collected in a more indirect way. As the bee moves about in and on the flower, pollen-grains fall all over her body and readily adhere to the branched hairs which are thickly scattered over its surface. The first joint of each foot (tarsus) is provided with a thick coating of moistened bristles, and these are used to brush together and collect the pollen scattered over the body of the bee.

Unless the honey harvest be unusually bountiful the young bee which has just started collecting food will confine herself to pollen, but after some days she will turn her attention to honey, or rather to nectar, which is not at all the same thing as honey. The proboscis is sunk into the nectaries of the flower and the sweet juice is sucked up. The nectar is stored in the so-called honey-crop for transference to the hive, and when a bee is seen seeking her home with her abdomen distended by a full honey-crop it is useless to search her for pollen; reciprocally a bee whose hinder legs are burdened with pollen has ever a slender abdomen. Except at the time of swarming,

FIG. 3.

A bee upon the wing, showing the position of the middle legs when they touch and pat down pollen masses. (Casteel.)

when the bees that leave the hive gorge themselves with honey so as to have some provision for their new home, no worker ever leaves the hive laden with honey. A bee with a swollen abdomen is always a homing bee.

The area from which bees collect nectar and pollen usually extends over a circle whose radius is three to four kilometres, although, under special circumstances, i.e. an unusually rich supply of nectar, bees may fly six or even seven kilometres, but first they carefully orientate themselves so as to fix the position of the hive in their brain. The return journey causes no trouble and is quick, a heavily-laden bee flying home at the rate of 12 to 20 kilometres an hour. A bee without honey and without pollen is said by some observers to fly

at the rate of 32 kilometres an hour, whilst others claim that a speed of 65 kilometres an hour can be attained.

Nectar is a sweet watery fluid which in almost every case has a specific flavour associated with the flower from which it is drawn. This specific flavour as a rule disappears in the honey, which is a much less watery fluid than the nectar. The several changes which nectar undergoes in becoming honey begin in the honey-crop, where the saliva which is mixed with the nectar starts the transformation of the cane-sugar of the nectar into the dextrose (grape-sugar) and laevulose (fruit-sugar) of the honey, and this process continues after the fluid has been deposited in the waxen cells. When honey is plentiful the cells stored with pollen will receive, before they are covered in, a little honey as well as a little saliva, together with a minute drop of formic acid which acts as a preservative. The need of honey in the hive surpasses that of pollen, and the honey-cells are more numerous than 'bee-bread' cells. The stored honey and pollen serve for the daily food of the workers, the drones and the queen, but in a healthy hive there is a surplus store, and this surplus store enables the community of honey-bees to last year after year, whilst the existence of, say, a wasp-nest depends on the success of a single individual in tiding over the winter months. Although in the winter the activities of the hive drop to a minimum, still there is some movement of the bees and so food is imperative.

The fresh nectar poured out of the body of the bee contains 80 per cent. of water and is very fluid. Why it remains in the cell and does not pour out before the cell is 'capped' is rather a mystery. Truly, the cells are tipped a little upwards, but not enough to explain this; later, when it thickens into honey it may be said to be too viscous to flow out, yet if the comb be lightly shaken down it comes in a sweet and sticky stream. One of the most interesting factors in the conversion of nectar to honey is the removal of the superfluous water. The worker-bees after a hard day in the field return to the hive, and after depositing their evening harvest, take their stand in serried rows and begin fanning with their wings. Tireless and apparently without fatigue they continue this exercise hour after hour until the rising of the sun recalls them to their harvest fields. A good hive will in the course

of a night drive out of a skip an amount of aqueous vapour equivalent to 1·5 litres of water, and so gradually the amount of water is reduced from 80 per cent. in the nectar to 25 per cent. in the honey. Both worker-cells and drone-cells are used for storing honey, and if the supply necessitates the building of new cells to house the precious fluid, drone-cells are built, for they are easier to construct and require comparatively less wax.

Dr. Stadler has made an ingenious calculation as to the number of journeys a worker-bee makes at harvest-time, and arrives at the conclusion that each bee makes between 75 and 100 flights a day. Even bee protoplasm cannot stand such a life. Working like the students at Osborne or Dartmouth 'at the double' all day, standing with vibrant wings all night, occupied with the cares of the hive in between times, never having any sleep, never taking any rest, it is little wonder that the frail body of the worker is at the height of the season worn out in five or six weeks. True to her devotion to the cleanliness of the hive, she usually dies outside it, but if by any chance she dies inside, the body is removed by the survivors like any other piece of lumber. Vergil's statement put into English by Dryden:

'Their friends attend the herse, the next relations mourn'

cannot be justified even by poetic licence. The friends and relations are totally indifferent. Bees know neither love nor regret.

It is the general rule amongst the social Hymenoptera that new colonies are started by the unaided efforts of a single queen, but this rule is broken by the honey-bee. Here the queen when starting a new colony is accompanied by a large number of workers and a few drones, the whole constituting the swarm. The preliminaries to swarming are many; the first is the laying of unfertilised eggs in the drone-cells old or new, for the drones take the longest time in reaching maturity; then a certain number of queen-cells are built and provided with fertilised eggs, laid one after another so that they will be ripe for entrance into the hive at successive intervals of forty-eight hours. When once the cover is placed on the first of these royal-cells, which hang usually to the number of six or eight from the lower edge of a comb,

with the mouth downwards, the reigning queen becomes restless. She intermits her egg-laying, moves uneasily hither and thither, and with an unbridled jealousy tries to break into the royal-cells and so destroy her royal offspring and possible successors. These, however, are safely guarded by the workers and seldom does she succeed. If the weather be favourable and if the provision of honey and bee-bread be ample, the workers are also seized with the demon of unrest. Those engaged in collecting nectar and honey cease their labours and remain at home. On a still, warm day in May or June numerous bees may be seen resting and motionless outside the hive; these are joined by others, and gradually they all collect together and hang like a beard in front of the hive. More bees attach themselves to the beard, and then suddenly the whole thing breaks up and the constituent bees pour into the hive and fill themselves up with honey as a provision for their future home. The excitement within the hive increases, the noise becomes louder and louder, and then suddenly a vast stream of bees, both workers and drones, with their queen, pours out of the mouth of the hive in a state of delirious tumult. Soon, however, they settle on some bough or wall chosen by the queen. Some hang to the support, the others hang on to them. The queen is hidden within the living, seething mass. Here the swarm may hang for hours and even for days, but as a rule within a few hours they are guided by certain scouts, who have been investigating the possibilities of the neighbourhood, to some hollow tree or shelter under a roof, and to this retreat the whole swarm flies by the shortest possible route. The workers at once set to work to clean the new hive and to prepare the comb, and as soon as possible the queen resumes her interminable egg-laying. It may be noted that whilst thus swarming the

FIG. 4.

Swarm of Bees (after Schajo), as in Dr. Stadler's 'Biologie der Biene.'

queen sees the light for the second time in her life. When swarming, bees are very loath to sting, and, according to Latter, should they do so the sting is 'comparatively 'innocuous.' An average swarm is about the size of a football and weighs about 4 lbs.

The hive which the swarm has left has for the time no queen, though potentialities of royalty exist in the numerous royal-cells. As soon as the first of these young queens is ready to emerge she bites through the cover of her cell, aided by some of the workers, and steps into the hive; but this does not take place until eight days have elapsed since the swarming. As soon as the young queen has been cleaned and has acquired a little strength and her wings have hardened, she begins to move about, and when she becomes aware of the other royal-cells with the pupae of her sisters therein she becomes violently excited, utters a well-known war-note, and attempts to tear open the cell of the oldest. Sometimes this is permitted, and the ruthless young monarch slays with her sting in turn the whole succession of royal infants. Should her strength fail her the slaughter is continued by the workers, who in any case greedily consume what royal-jelly is left in the cells, and draw the corpses of their victims out of the cells and cast them out of the hive.

This process of slaughter is, however, a very risky proceeding, for if anything should happen to the conquering and sole remaining queen on her wedding-flight, or at any other time, and if there were no larvae under three days of age (these can be reared into queens by a continuous diet of royal-jelly) the hive would become queenless, and a queenless hive rapidly falls into a state of 'death, damnation, and despair.' Therefore the bees usually guard the cells until the first queen has been fertilised and has returned to the hive, and also until it has been clearly settled that a second swarming is not to take place, for in that case the first hatched queen would lead the swarm and one of her sisters would be wanted to replace her in the hive. Should there be a second swarm it will centre round the young queen as yet unfertilised, and it may be that some of her sisters may then escape and join the swarm, in which case it either breaks up into as many small swarms as there are queens, or the queens fight till but one remains, or the workers put all to death save one. A fight between

two queens is a venomous and a deadly affair. Although sisters, although members of the same exalted and exiguous caste, they seem to be animated by the bitterest hatred, yet so strongly implanted in their being is their devotion to the future of the community that when, as they sometimes do, they get into a mutually murderous position where a stroke of the sting of each would kill the other, they immediately cease fighting and retire trembling for a time, apparently appalled at the prospect of the queenless hive which would result from their killing each other. After a time, however, the combat is renewed and one or other is slain.

Sometimes when a second queen enters the hive and the reigning queen is busy laying eggs, the presence of the intruder is concealed and a crowd of workers surrounds her on every side, ' balling ' her in until she dies of hunger and suffocation, but they never sting her to death.

For the first few days (from two to six after her birth) the young queen shows no disposition to be married. Then a change occurs. She becomes restless, runs to the hive-mouth and back, and presently makes a short experimental flight, for the first time seeing the sun and inflating to the full her breathing tubes. Soon she takes wider flights, always keeping her head directed to the hive. After a time she is followed by a group of drones, and as she towers into space one by one these suitors drop off until one, the strongest, remains to mate with her high up in the heavens. The act of mating is fatal to the male. It is thought that he dies of nerve-shock. Whatever the cause, most of his body falls dead to the earth, but he leaves part of it in the queen ; this can only be removed when it has shrivelled up, and then, in some cases, only by the aid of the workers. The fertilised queen returns to the hive, having in her spermatheca no less than 200,000,000 spermatozoa, a supply equal to even her prodigious fecundity.

Once the queen is fertilised and has begun her ceaseless egg-laying the drones are more useless than ever. They have always been a nuisance in the hive, devouring the best honey, hustling the workers, impeding the work and fouling the combs ; for, unlike the workers who can only rid themselves of undigested food when on the wing, the drones and the queen deposit their excreta in the hive for the workers to

clear away. Useless, and a great drain on the hive, they are yet suffered to survive a little while, but in a few days that curious socialistic instinct that persistently impels the honey-bee to sacrifice the individual for the sake of the community—'l'esprit de la ruche' as Maeterlinck calls it—is awakened, and the workers unite to destroy the drones, either by driving them forth, or by forcing them into an empty comb and starving them to death, or by savagely attacking them with sting and jaws, till they are killed outright.

The same 'esprit de la ruche,' the same overwhelming instinct to provide at all costs for the continuance of the race, causes the worker-bees to work themselves to death in a few weeks for the sake of succeeding generations, and condemns the queen-bee to a life sentence, which often takes four or five years to work out, of penal servitude in pitchy darkness.

A. E. Shipley.

THE PRODUCTION OF POWER

1. **Die Dampfturbinen.** By A. Stodola. Berlin: Julius Springer. 1910.
2. **The Design and Construction of Internal Combustion Engines.** By Hugo Güldner. Constable. 1910.
3. **Diesel Engines for Land and Marine Work.** By A. P. Chalkley. Constable. 1913.
4. **Power House Design.** By J. F. C. Snell. Longmans, Green. 1911.
5. **The Gas, Oil and Petrol Engine.** By D. Clerk and G. A. Burls. Longmans, Green. 1913.

THE rapid progress made in the production of power during the two last decades started when the industrial development of electricity made it possible to transmit power to a distance, and brought into existence the new industry of producing power for sale. Twenty years ago there were only a few insignificant or experimental electric-transmission plants; neglecting these, power could be transmitted over a distance exceeding a few tens of yards by three methods only: by ropes, by compressed or rarefied air in pipes, and by water under pressure in pipes. Transmission of power by ropes was common on the Continent, but its distribution was impracticable. Power was, and still is, distributed by water in London, but the only non-electrical transmission and distribution plant that ever operated on a large scale was the compressed-air system in Paris. Twenty years ago power was distributed for sale only by a few isolated plants. Now, in England alone there are 350 electric stations distributing a total of some 1,000,000 horse-power for producing light, heat, or mechanical power.

The progress in power generation must be regarded as a direct consequence of the development of the business of selling power, because this business for the first time gave to engineers both the incentive and the means to study and ascertain the cost of producing power. The incentive lay in the natural desire for the success of the business, which,

apart from the minor costs of distribution, depends entirely on the cost of production. The means lay in the ease of measuring electrical power and of ascertaining every item making up the total cost of each unit generated. Armed with this knowledge, and with a knowledge of his colleague's work, an engineer can at once lay his finger on any point where undue waste occurs, can compare the economy of his different engines, and can from published data compare the running of his station with that of another station equipped with different plant. The effect of these facilities is seen with striking clearness on comparing plants installed in power-distributing stations with private plants in factories. While many of the latter are thoroughly up to date, there are still an enormous number of factories which have retained machines and methods, good in their day, but now so bad, as compared with modern standards, that the saving in a few years' working of a new plant would pay its initial cost. That such cases can exist in the light of present knowledge is due, first, to the factory manager not having the same interest as the station engineer in reducing his power costs, because they often form but a small item in the total costs ; secondly, to his not knowing what the power costs are in relation to the power generated, because he either does not or cannot carry out the work of measuring the power ; and thirdly, to his not having the expert knowledge needed to determine what is the best power plant for the particular conditions of the factory.

This last is the main difficulty ; there is no such thing as a best type of power plant, though a particular type of plant is generally the best for a particular set of conditions. The cost of power production depends more on the conditions of supply than on the plant itself, and of all the conditions affecting the cost, the most important is the 'load factor.' This factor is defined in more than one way, but is generally taken to be the amount of energy actually generated in the year expressed as a percentage of the amount which would be generated if the plant worked at full load night and day. Chemical factories often require a continuous and steady load, and their load factor then approaches 100 per cent. The ordinary factory, working day-time only, has a load factor of from 20 to 30 per cent. Electric light stations have the

worst load factors, 10 to 15 per cent., because the demand for power is very small except for short periods in the evening and early morning. The effect of load factor on cost of production is easy to appreciate. The interest and depreciation on the capital expended and the administrative costs are the same whether the plant is worked much or little. Repairs, maintenance, lubricating oil, and wages depend on how many engines are working, but remain practically the same if an engine works at full load or half load. Fuel is the only item of expense that depends on the energy generated, and this depends greatly on the extent to which the engines work at their full and most economical load. It follows that, with a large load factor, fuel is the all-important item of cost, and capital charges become insignificant, so that a plant to work under this condition should be designed for fuel economy regardless of initial expense. On the other hand, with a low load factor the capital charges are often the largest item in the costs, and in this case fuel economy may be sacrificed for a cheaper type of plant.

Generally, it is better to employ two or three large engines in preference to a larger number of small engines, because a large engine is more economical in fuel than a small one, requires no more attention and not much more maintenance; on the other hand, an engine working at half load is less economical than when working at full load, so that the size of engine selected should depend on the nature of the load. Local conditions often influence the choice of a type of plant; coal varies largely in cost in different districts while in England oil varies but little, so that whether coal or oil be taken as the fuel may depend on the locality; space may be so restricted as to be the sole criterion in the selection; lack of water may rule out steam, while the need for steam heating may rule out gas or oil engines. Many other points affect the design of a power plant, but those mentioned will give an idea of the considerations affecting type of plant and will enable the characteristics of different engines to be appreciated.

Steam engines and turbines, gas engines and Diesel engines are all 'heat engines'; they are supplied with heat from the fuel and reject a large quantity of it; the difference, less certain losses, is converted into mechanical energy. The

simplest form of heat engine is the hot-air engine, used very successfully, in quite small sizes, for pumping. In this engine the air in the engine cylinder is heated, and by its expansion drives the piston forward; in expanding, the air becomes cooled; the piston then returns, and the air is again heated. The air is merely a vehicle for heat—in thermodynamics it is called the 'working fluid.' No material thing, but heat only, is supplied to the engine. In the steam engine, or turbine, the working fluid is steam. Heat is given to the steam in the boiler, and by the steam is supplied to the engine; the steam when rejected by the engine into the exhaust or condenser is at a lower temperature than when it entered the engine; part of its heat was abstracted by the engine and part of this again was converted into mechanical energy. In the gas or Diesel engine there is no auxiliary apparatus, such as a boiler, to impart heat to the working fluid; the fuel itself is introduced into the cylinder of the engine, and there gives its heat to the working fluid (a mixture of air and products of combustion) at the very point where the heat has to do its work. This direct application of the heat, avoiding the losses which necessarily accompany auxiliary heating apparatus, is one of the reasons why a gas or Diesel engine is more efficient than a steam engine.

The efficiency of a heat engine is the ratio of the quantity of heat converted into mechanical energy to the total quantity of heat supplied, the ratio being generally expressed as a percentage. Thus if 100 heat units were supplied to the engine and 20 of them turned into mechanical energy, the efficiency of the engine would be 20 per cent. At the time of the Aisgill disaster, the 'Daily Telegraph' published an article in which the efficiency of the steam locomotive was said to be about 10 per cent. This is an accurate statement but apt to mislead; it conveys the impression that when engineers become competent they will increase the efficiency of the steam-engine plant to some reasonable figure, say 50 per cent., so that then the same quantity of coal will produce five times as much power. As a matter of fact, an efficiency as high as 50 per cent. for a steam plant is as impossible as anything physical can be, and it is doubtful if any of us will live to see an efficiency of even 30 per cent. attained in practice.

The reason of this may easily be seen from an hydraulic

analogy. Imagine a river reaching the sea at the top of a cliff 100 feet high, and a turbine installed to derive power from the river in its fall to the sea. Imagine now that the river were diverted into a mine 900 feet deep below sea level, and the turbine fixed at the bottom of the mine. The total fall would then be 1000 feet, and the turbine would derive ten times as much power from the river, supposing always that the mine did not fill up. If in these hypothetical circumstances the turbine were put at sea level, it might be said that it used only 100 feet of a possible 1000 feet of the waterfall, so that its efficiency was only 10 per cent. Now, instead of a river, take a quantity of heat in the form of steam or any other form; and instead of levels, take temperatures. The temperature of steam in a boiler working at 125 lb. per square inch pressure, i.e. 350° F., may be taken as the equivalent to the top of the waterfall, and the ordinary atmospheric temperature of 60° F. as equivalent to sea-level. The temperature equivalent to the bottom of the mine in our water analogy is the point called 'absolute zero,' which is −459° F., or 491° below freezing point. This absolute zero is a point such that, if the steam were condensed into water, the water frozen to ice, and the ice cooled to the absolute zero, all the heat energy originally in the steam would have been taken out of it. Therefore, in order to make full use of the heat energy theoretically available, the engine would have to reject the steam at the absolute zero of temperature, the fall of temperature in that event being 350° + 459°, or 809° F. But the air temperature of 60° F. is the lowest natural temperature available, just as there is no lower level available for waterfalls than sea level. A refrigerator would soon be heated up by the inflowing steam, just as a mine would be filled up by a waterfall. The maximum possible fall of temperature, therefore, is from 350° to 60°, or 290° F., so that a steam engine, if quite perfect in every way, could use a fall of only 290° out of the 809° necessary to extract all the heat energy of the steam. This gives a maximum efficiency of 36 per cent., an efficiency which no engine, be it a steam reciprocating engine, a steam turbine, or a gas engine, can exceed, so long as the heat is supplied to it at a temperature not exceeding 350° F. Further, no engine, even if it were mechanically perfect, could reach this efficiency; for in the

process of converting the heat energy into work, a loss of efficiency dependent on the working fluid, whether gas or steam, and on the type of engine, must occur, even regarding the process theoretically and not practically. Finally, over and above these losses of efficiency come the frictional and other losses due to the engine being an imperfect machine.

The most obvious way to increase the efficiency of an engine is to increase the fall of temperature which it uses. This can be done either by raising the steam to a higher temperature or by arranging for its rejection at a lower temperature. In steam plants great progress has been made in both these directions, especially since the introduction of steam turbines. The temperature of the steam supplied can be increased either by increasing the boiler pressure or by 'superheating' the steam. At atmospheric pressure water boils at 212° F.; at 125 lb. per square inch pressure at 353° F.; and at 200 lb. pressure at 388° F. A pressure of 200 lb. per square inch is not generally exceeded in practice; it is now a common pressure for steam turbines, but is a high pressure for reciprocating engines. For pressures of this magnitude and over in a reciprocating engine, three cylinders, making a 'triple' expansion engine, are usual; but increase in the number of cylinders means increase in capital cost, increase in frictional and other losses, and increase in cost of maintenance, and in these increases much of the gain in efficiency due to the higher pressure is lost. In steam turbines it is sufficient to increase the length of the turbine to enable it to make use of a higher pressure, and this can be done at a small increase in cost and negligible increases in losses and maintenance.

To raise the temperature of the steam still further, the steam from the boiler is passed through a 'superheater' consisting of a number of tubes heated by a furnace, generally the boiler furnace, but sometimes an independent furnace. In this apparatus it is easy to get steam at very high temperatures; the difficulty lies in constructing the engine or turbine to use it. All parts exposed to steam expand, and at high temperatures the expansion becomes troublesome. It cannot be prevented, but provision has to be made for it to take place without straining other parts which do not expand to the same extent. In reciprocating engines the chief difficulty in the use of high-temperature steam lies in the

lubrication. All oils become less effective as the temperature increases, and only the highest qualities are of any use at high steam temperatures. Lubrication systems which are efficient at 350° F. may be useless at 500° F., and at such temperatures the slightest failure in lubrication generally causes serious damage. It is now generally recognised that it does not pay to superheat the steam for reciprocating engines except to a small extent.

With turbines the position is different; lubrication is not affected because the parts requiring lubrication are not exposed to steam. On the other hand, the difficulty in providing for expansion is great. A turbine consists of rows of blades revolving at very high speed between corresponding rows of fixed blades, and, since the parts of the turbine may increase in length from heat by much more than the space between the revolving blades and the fixed blades or the casing, the difficulty in always maintaining a safe clearance between the revolving and fixed parts is obvious. Any contact between them is liable to tear out a row of blades, and, as a consequence—common in early days and still not rare—to 'strip' the whole machine clear of blades. This has been the fate of many early turbines and is still the fate of a few modern ones. The difficulties due to expansion have gradually been surmounted, and now it is common to superheat the steam for turbines by 200° F., giving, with a pressure of 200 lb. per square inch, a total temperature of 588° F.

The alternative method of increasing the fall of temperatures which is the basis of engine efficiency, is to lower the temperature at which the steam is rejected by the engine. Here again, the steam turbine is responsible for the progress made. The temperature of steam at atmospheric pressure is 212° F.; to reduce the temperature below 212° F., the pressure must be reduced—that is, a vacuum has to be produced. This is done in a 'condenser' in which the steam is brought either into contact with cold water or into a space filled with tubes through which water is passed. The lowest temperature attained in practice is 80° F., corresponding to a vacuum which is 97 per cent. of absolute vacuum. To reach this means a large condenser and a large quantity of cold water, some seventy times as much water as the steam to be condensed. But in reciprocating engines it is not worth while going to the expense of so large a

condenser, because the engine cannot make sufficient use of steam at so low a temperature. For this reason the vacua for reciprocating engines do not often exceed 87 per cent. of absolute vacuum, corresponding to a temperature of 126° F.

In turbines, on the other hand, it is quite practicable, without high cost, gradually to increase the size of the blades as the steam gets larger and larger in volume, so that steam at any attainable vacuum can be efficiently used. The temperature limits of the turbine, omitting superheat, now are 388° F. for the steam supply and 80° F. for the steam exhaust, a fall of 308° F., corresponding to a maximum theoretical efficiency of 36 per cent. The limits usual with the reciprocating engine are 370° F. and 126° F., a fall of 244° F., corresponding to a theoretical efficiency of 29 per cent. This increase from 29 per cent. to 36 per cent.—an increase of 24 per cent.—is an immense advance to have made in a period of some eight years —a period during which the turbine, after catching up in efficiency the reciprocating engine, began to overtake it.

The steam turbine superficially appears to be the simplest form of engine it is possible to imagine, consisting as it does of a single revolving part; but in spite of the apparent simplicity of the machine, the constructional difficulties have been enormous. That they have been surmounted is due solely to two men—de Laval in Sweden and Parsons in England —who, working independently, the former on the impulse type and the latter on the reaction type of turbine, carried out some of the most brilliant inventive and designing work that has ever been done. They were not quite the first to make turbines. Hero's reaction turbine, of the second century B.C., was the first, and Branca's impulse turbine of the seventeenth century the second; but from the time of Branca to 1882, when de Laval produced his first turbine, no successful turbine was constructed. One point may be mentioned to give an idea of the difficulties which have to be surmounted. To secure good efficiency the peripheral speed of the blades should approach half the steam velocity, which means that turbine shafts, wheels, and blades must rotate at speeds up to 30,000 revolutions per minute for small machines, while 2400 revolutions per minute is a usual speed for large machines of many-thousand horse-power. The centrifugal force of such speeds is enormous; wheels fitted tightly on to their shafts

stretch and become loose ; vibrations are set up which, without special provisions, would wreck the machine ; and steam joints have to be made between the rotating shaft and the casing to prevent high-pressure steam leaking where the speed prevents the use of the ordinary soft packing pressed on to the shaft.

In every engine, and in nearly every machine, development has been in increase of speed. The turbine is the fastest engine that exists ; speed for it is essential to efficiency, but in other engines speed has been increased because a faster machine is a cheaper machine. The old steam engines were horizontal slow-moving machines, and magnificent machines most of them were. For reliability they have never been equalled by any later engine, but their cost and bulk would now be regarded as prohibitive. They were ousted by vertical high-speed engines of the Willans type, turning at four or five times the speed, occupying one-eighth of the floor space, costing half as much to buy and twice as much for maintenance. The use of electrical power was a further incentive to increase the engine speed, because the cost of a dynamo of given power is inversely proportional to its speed, and therefore if the dynamo was to be coupled directly to the engine—that is, fixed on the engine shaft instead of having to be driven by belts or ropes—high speed in the engine was necessary to secure cheapness in the dynamo. These fast-running engines reached a high degree of efficiency (though not higher than the slow-speed) on test ; but practice was different from the test, for wear of the valves and consequent leakage of steam reduced the efficiency rapidly. In this respect the turbine has one of its most important advantages ; the fall in its efficiency from long use is negligible, and its wearing parts are so few that its cost of maintenance is low, while the low initial cost and small floor-space required make it the cheapest engine that exists. For all cases except small plants without condenser the turbine has an advantage over the reciprocating engine on nearly every point.

On two points the turbine presents certain difficulties. A turbine cannot reverse its direction of rotation, a requirement almost confined to ships ; and secondly, its speed of rotation is for many purposes too high. This is the case in ships ; a speed that makes the turbine efficient makes the screw

propeller inefficient. To get over this difficulty Parsons introduced a pair of gear wheels between turbine shaft and propeller shaft, and for the first time transmitted very large powers at very high speeds through gear wheels. Gears had been used previously by de Laval for transmitting quite small powers, but the present year has seen a development in the use of large gears for driving electrical machines. It was said above that a dynamo becomes cheaper the faster it runs, but this only holds up to a certain speed. At turbine speeds constructional difficulties make the cost higher than at low speeds, and in direct-current dynamos beyond a certain size the difficulties have not yet been overcome. Messrs. Parsons, however, got round these difficulties in their installation in July last of a 6000 horse-power turbine to drive through gears comparatively slow-running direct-current dynamos. The firm have now decided to adopt this system in the future instead of driving dynamos at turbine speeds. There is little doubt that the use of gears will rapidly extend to numbers of cases where turbine speeds are too high, and so increase the field open to the turbine.

Before leaving the subject of steam engines it is desirable to mention a type of reciprocating engine which has shown remarkable economy. In the ordinary engine steam at full pressure is admitted at one end of the cylinder, and after the piston has completed its course the expanded and cooled steam is driven out at the same end of the cylinder. This end of the cylinder thus serves alternately for the admission of hot steam and the exhaust of cooler steam, and is thereby subjected to alternations of temperature which cause loss of heat. In the Stumpf engine, called the 'Gleichström' or 'Uniflow' engine, the steam flows always in one direction through the cylinder, being admitted at one end and exhausted from the other. The cylinder thus has a hot end and a cooler end, and is not subjected to the same alternations of temperature. Engines of this type up to about 400 horse-power have been built; they are simple in construction and give better efficiencies than have ever been attained by other reciprocating engines of the same size.

Turning now to gas engines, their working has been made familiar to all by their general use in motor cars. Oil engines

and petrol engines are both gas engines, because the oil or petrol is turned into gas before entering the cylinder by an auxiliary apparatus termed a carburettor. The Diesel and some semi-Diesel engines which use various kinds of oil are not, strictly speaking, gas engines, because their oil enters the cylinder as a liquid and not as a gas.

In a gas engine the cylinder is filled with a combustible mixture of gas and air which is compressed to about 130 lb. per square inch by a stroke of the piston and then ignited by a spark, when the pressure suddenly rises to about 375 lb. per square inch. In a Diesel engine the cylinder is filled with air only, which is compressed to about 500 lb. per square inch. At this pressure the air is red-hot and capable of igniting the oil which is sprayed in gradually, so as to maintain the pressure constant for a short portion of the piston stroke, but not to increase it. Semi-Diesel engines differ in type, some being nearer to the Diesel and others to the gas-engine type, but, as their compression pressures are never enough to ignite the oil, they all depend for ignition on a dome-shaped cover to the cylinder which has no provision for cooling and so is kept by the combustion at a temperature high enough for ignition. To start the engine this dome-shaped cover is heated by an independent blow-lamp.

The efficiencies of gas and Diesel engines are far higher than those of steam engines, because the temperature at which heat is supplied to them is far higher than any steam temperature that has been reached in practice. In gas engines the temperature of the mixture in the cylinder after ignition is of the order of 2750° F. and its temperature, at the moment of leaving the cylinder, about 900° F. This fall of temperature corresponds to a theoretical limit of efficiency of 58 per cent. In the Diesel engine the temperatures are higher still, reaching 4500° F. as the temperature of combustion, but the theoretical limit of efficiency is not correspondingly higher owing to the temperature of the exhaust gases being also higher. In practice efficiencies are about 26 per cent. for gas engines and 30 per cent. for Diesel engines, though under test conditions higher efficiencies are common.

In Diesel engines the engine itself represents the whole of the plant, the fuel as purchased being introduced into the cylinder. In gas engines the fuel has first to be made, ordinary

coal-gas being too extravagant a fuel for any but quite small engines; but in making a fuel for the engine from coal there are losses which reduce the efficiency of the whole gas-engine plant as compared with the Diesel engine. Gas for engines is made in a 'producer' consisting of a vertical retort filled with ignited coal and supplied with a mixed blast of air and steam. The air supplied being insufficient to burn the coal completely, a combustible gas is formed consisting mainly of carbon monoxide, hydrogen, and nitrogen. In the ordinary producer the air and steam are forced in by a blower; in the 'suction-gas producer' the gas engine itself is used to draw the air and steam through the producer. In the last decade the use of suction-gas producers and gas engines increased to an enormous extent, because for small plants up to 100 or 200 horse-power they formed by far the most economical power plant till the advent of the Diesel engine.

The main difficulty in connexion with gas producers for supplying engines is the presence of tar in the gas in the form of vapour. The tar is deposited in the valves and cylinder of the engine and soon puts the engine out of action. In small plants anthracite coal which is almost free of tar is used, but in large plants the cheaper bituminous coal is used and the tar extracted from the gas by cooling, washing, and filtering it. It is, however, so difficult to extract all the tar, that the cleaning of engines fed with gas from bituminous coal becomes a serious item in the running costs. The bituminous coal-gas producer was modified by Mond so as to produce ammonium sulphate as a by-product, and, given a suitable coal, the value of the sulphate produced is about three-quarters of the cost of the coal used at prices ruling in colliery districts. The modification consists in the addition of a large quantity of steam to reduce the temperature in the producer and prevent the dissociation of the ammonia gas formed. The ammonia gas is extracted by passing the producer gas through sulphuric acid to convert it into ammonium sulphate.

Assuming the efficiency of a Diesel engine to be 30 per cent. the price of oil would have to be 66*s*. per ton to give the same cost of energy as with gas plant using anthracite at 30*s*. per ton. Now, when the Diesel engine had got over its early troubles, oil could be purchased at from 40*s*. to 50*s*.

per ton, and the Diesel engine therefore showed a marked economy which was in reality greater than shown by the figures in the case of low-load factors, because gas producers are wasteful in starting up and shutting down. Users of power were not slow in taking advantage of this economy, and the production of Diesel engines during the past five years has been enormous. Oil now commands from 70*s.* to 80*s.* per ton, and the position is entirely different; for a fair load factor the suction-gas plant is more economical than the Diesel engine, and the latter has the advantage only where the low-load and no-load losses of the producer bring down the average efficiency of the gas plant. On the other hand, the Diesel engine is very high in first cost, and with low-load factors its high capital charges may outweigh its fuel economy. Here the semi-Diesel engine comes into the field by offering the advantage of a much lower cost at a slight sacrifice of fuel economy. The whole future of gas and Diesel engines turns on the price of oil, and prophecies about oil prices are too divergent to give any idea what the future will be.

It remains to bring steam plants into the comparison, and this leads to the subject of boilers. A boiler wastes heat by the hot furnace-gases flowing up the chimney, by escape of heat from the casing, by the leakage of air into the furnace, and by incomplete combustion of the coal. All these losses have, in recent years, been greatly reduced. The first loss is reduced by fitting in the flue an 'economiser,' or nest of tubes exposed to the hot gases and containing the water which is to be fed to the boiler. It is only a matter of increasing the size of the economiser to extract as much heat as is desired from the gases and save it by putting it into the boiler water. The limit is reached when the gases are cooled either too much to give the necessary chimney draught or so much as to deposit acid moisture which corrodes the economiser tubes. The second and third sources of loss are reduced by a recent improvement in boiler casings, which consists in a casing of iron-plate lined with magnesia slabs instead of the more usual brickwork. The escape of heat is less, but the more important advantage lies in the prevention of air leakage into the spaces filled with burning gases. The brickwork casing, though it could be built air-tight, inevitably became cracked and leaky in the course of a few years. The

last loss has been reduced by mechanical stokers, which supply and distribute coal to the furnace with greater uniformity than is possible by hand. The result of these detail improvements has been to increase the efficiency up to 80 per cent., the 20 per cent. loss being, roughly, half in the chimney, one-quarter in escape of heat from the casing, and one-quarter in the ashes. Perhaps the greatest progress made in boilers has been in the saving of labour. Coal is lifted by conveyors from railway trucks or barges to a row of ' bunkers ' above the boilers, and from these falls into the hoppers of the mechanical stokers, which distribute it on the grate. The boiler attendant then has little to do beyond adjustment of the coal and water supply, and a boiler plant of many thousand horse-power can be run by one or two men.

From coal to power, the steam plant with turbines has reached an efficiency of about 20 per cent. in large installations of over 1000 horse-power working under the best conditions. For smaller and less perfect installations 15 per cent. must be regarded as a good figure. Steam plant never reaches the efficiency of gas plant when both are working under best possible conditions, but steam-turbine plant is more easily kept up to best conditions than gas plant, and it may be said that in practice large steam plants are equal to gas plants in fuel economy, but that the latter have a distinct advantage over small steam plants. With a variable load, the combination of steam plant and Diesel engines is coming into favour ; the steam plant can be worked steadily, under economic conditions, and the Diesel engine, which has no stand-by losses, is used to take occasional heavy loads above the capacity of the steam plant.

From the above comparison on the basis of fuel economy it might be supposed that gas and Diesel engines had a clear field and would gradually displace steam. This is by no means the case, and for large plants it is seldom that they can compete with steam. They have the advantage in fuel economy and—especially in the case of Diesel engines—of small low-load and no-load losses ; they have the advantage under special local conditions where water and floor-space are costly ; they are approximately on an equality as regards attendance, though here they have the advantage in quite small plants ; in consumption of lubricating oil they are far behind the

steam turbine. But where gas and Diesel engines are at a serious disadvantage as compared with steam is in the cost of repairs and maintenance and in reliability of running, and also, in the case of large installations, in the size of engine available. The very conditions that give to gas and Diesel engines their high economy, namely the high temperature and pressure under which they work, are conditions that lead to trouble and wear in running. Pistons have to work in contact with white-hot gases and, if they be not kept sufficiently cool, or if there be the slightest lack of oil between piston and cylinder, the piston 'seizes' in the cylinder and the resulting damage may be anything up to a wreck of the engine.

Up to a certain size of cylinder the piston is cooled by conduction to the cylinder walls and by the air on its outer surface; but beyond this size and in all double-acting engines the piston is made hollow and water-cooled, the water connexion to the moving piston being a troublesome piece of design. The stresses in the cylinder casting, due partly to the pressure but mainly to the temperature, have led to innumerable cracked cylinders, and it seems impossible to design an engine cylinder of a new type or of a new size with any certainty of its withstanding the stresses. The history of gas and Diesel engine building shows, with few exceptions, that the first engines built to a new design or of a larger size of cylinder have been failures, however great the experience of the builders may have been. The tendency is to design for greater efficiency and for low initial cost; the former means higher temperatures and pressures and the latter means increased speed, and both lead to greater constructional difficulties and less reliability. It has in fact been the experience of insurance companies that Diesel engines of to-day are more liable to break-down than those of a few years ago.

So long as gas and Diesel engines are subject to some two or three failures in a year's work, steam will hold its own, even under conditions where it is less economical. In gas and Diesel engines reliability and fuel economy are antagonistic, and builders, under the stress of competition, tend to increase the economy at the sacrifice of reliability. It has been already pointed out that the importance of fuel depends greatly on the load factor, and while in some cases it may be worth striving for the highest economy possible, in others a gain in

reliability would more than compensate for a higher fuel consumption. There is ample room for improvement in this type of engine, far more than there is in steam plant, and at the present time so many firms are engaged in its manufacture that steady improvement is certain, and a change in the present relative position of steam and gas or oil plant is probable in the future; but past history points to the progress being slow.

A development rendered possible by the steam turbine has been an increase in the size of machine, and the advantage of having machines as large as the total load warrants has already been pointed out. At the present time a turbine made in England by Parsons is being installed at Chicago to develop 35,000 horse-power. So large a power, or anything approaching it, is impracticable in any single reciprocating engine, steam, gas, or Diesel. A gas engine with double-acting cylinder five feet in diameter would give not more than about 1500 horse-power, and this is a size of cylinder that, so far as the writer knows, has never been exceeded for gas engines. As the size of cylinder is increased the weights of the reciprocating parts mount up so rapidly that constructional difficulties soon limit the increase, and beyond this the power of a single engine can be increased only by increasing the number of cylinders. This means greater complexity, greater capital cost, and greater cost of maintenance, and a large part of the advantage possessed by a single large machine over a number of smaller machines is lost. Single machines of 6000 horse-power and over are now being installed in considerable numbers on land, and have long been common in ships; they are always steam turbines.

A few years ago, at the height of the Diesel boom, it was realised that a Diesel was the ideal engine for marine work; it meant an immense saving in boiler room and coal-storage capacity, and a pump for drawing the oil on board instead of the long and dirty process of coaling. Putting aside questions of reliability, the size of cylinder was the difficulty that presented itself; the usual power per cylinder in Diesel engines then was and still is about 150 horse-power, and more than fifty cylinders of this size would be required to make up engines of 8000 horse-power, such as are found on Channel steamers. Clearly, the Diesel can make headway in

marine work only by increasing the horse-power per cylinder, and makers have for some years directed their attention to this. Up to the present date little has been accomplished; there are but very few engines now running with more than 165 horse-power per cylinder in the ordinary type of engine, but the use of what is termed a two-stroke cycle, giving from 250 to 300 horse-power in the same size of cylinder, is on the increase. The largest power of which the writer has heard is a single cylinder 2 feet 8 inches in diameter made by Carels to give 1000 horse-power, built experimentally with a view to the construction of a six-cylinder 6000 horse-power engine.

Gas engines of 2000 horse-power and over have long been built with success, but are almost entirely confined to use with gas from blast furnaces and coke ovens. These furnaces and ovens give off enormous quantities of combustible gases, which previously were, and still to a great extent are, wasted. It has been estimated that in the industrial district on the north-east coast waste gases are produced capable of yielding 300,000 horse-power. British firms have been singularly backward in utilising these sources of power, and have been far outstripped by the Germans. The consequence has been that, though early progress in gas engines was mainly British, later progress in the construction of large engines has been made almost entirely by German, Austrian, and Belgian firms, to meet the demand for engines to utilise blast-furnace and coke-oven gases.

There is another form of heat, now readily convertible into power, which is being wasted in vast quantities throughout the country; the waste, measured in horse-power, probably could be reckoned in millions. This is the heat in the exhaust steam from all the reciprocating steam-engines which discharge their steam into the atmosphere and not into a condenser. It has been explained that a reciprocating engine cannot in practice make efficient use of the lower temperatures obtained by condensing; the same amount of steam will give only about 20 per cent. more power in a condensing than in a non-condensing engine, and, where condensing is not made easy by the existence of a river or other ample supply of water close at hand, reciprocating engines have been generally installed to exhaust their steam directly to the atmosphere. Up to some years ago this was not necessarily bad practice.

for the gain by condensing often did not warrant the expense of condensing plant; but now that turbines can be obtained to make full use of steam at low condenser temperatures, the position is entirely different. Turbines, called exhaust-steam turbines, are now built to take steam at atmospheric pressure or a few pounds above it, as it is exhausted from ordinary non-condensing engines, and they can, with a good condensing plant, derive from this steam as much power as does the reciprocating engine taking in the steam at high pressure, and even more power where the engine is old and wasteful.

This addition of an exhaust-steam turbine to an existing reciprocating engine is a means of turning a wasteful into a fairly efficient plant at comparatively small capital expenditure, and there now exist innumerable cases where the addition could be made and would effect a large saving in fuel. One class of these cases is found in the steam winding engines of collieries, which are large engines of from 500 to 1500 horse-power working intermittently at intervals of about a minute. Two methods are adopted to make use of the intermittent supply of steam from these engines: in one, the steam is led into an 'accumulator' consisting of a boiler-shell half full of water with means for mixing the incoming steam with the water. The supply of steam raises the pressure by one or two pounds, with the result that part of the steam is condensed to water. The turbine draws its supply of steam from the accumulator, and when the steam-flow from the winding engine ceases, the withdrawal of steam by the turbine has the effect of reducing the pressure and so re-converting part of the water into steam. The accumulator thus serves to bridge over the interval during which the winding engine is not working. The other method, which is now more generally adopted, is to employ a 'mixed-pressure turbine' instead of an exhaust turbine. The mixed-pressure turbine is an ordinary turbine capable of taking high-pressure steam direct from the boilers but with a second steam connexion at its centre, at a point where the pressure of the steam in the turbine has been reduced to about atmospheric pressure. The exhaust steam from the winding engine is connected at this point, and, while the engine is supplying exhaust steam, the high-pressure portion of the turbine, i.e. the portion up to this point, is doing no work; when the supply of exhaust steam fails, the valve supplying

high-pressure steam from the boilers is automatically opened, and then the whole of the turbine works, the valve automatically closing as soon as the supply of exhaust steam is renewed.

Turning now to water power, little progress has been made in turbines and water wheels because for many years there has been little room for improvement. Hydraulic plant can give out in mechanical power over 85 per cent. of the power in the waterfall, and this, for a machine, is very near perfection. Progress has been in the direction of utilising more of the water power available, and now few water powers exist which are worth making use of and are not utilised. Water power, however, when examined commercially, does not always present the advantage which, from an engineering point of view, it appears to possess. In industrial districts, where power is wanted, water power rarely exists. A water power in a mountainous district without facilities for transport is of little value ; only when the load factor is nearly 100 per cent., as in chemical works, and when the raw material and product are such as not to entail heavy transport charges, is an out-of-the-way waterfall worth utilising. Examples of such cases are found in Norway and Switzerland, where calcium carbide and other chemical factories, requiring a large, steady, night-and-day power load, have established themselves at the foot of high falls.

The reverse case, where the water power is brought by long electric transmission to the industry, is found chiefly in America and Italy. In Italy water power has been developed perhaps more than in any other country, partly on account of dear coal and partly as a result of the excellent laws regulating the water rights and the electric transmission generally necessary to utilise them. Every waterfall or river, not used for power before a certain date, belongs, as regards its power rights, to the Government, who will grant a concession for power to any applicant, subject to his making use of the power, at a nominal rental. The power generated can be transmitted to any point without the possibility of the scheme being blocked by the refusal of a way-leave by a proprietor *en route*. If England had adopted provisions similar to those in the Italian law of 1894, instead of the restrictive and often absurd regulations of the Fisheries Department of the Board of Trade and the cumbersome and costly parliamentary procedure, electrical

development in this country might have been able to compare with that now enjoyed in Italy. Fortunately for the industry, the electrical adviser to the Board of Trade has been a man of broad views, struggling to disentangle himself from the red tape abounding in his office and always doing his best for the industry. This has to some extent mitigated the effect of what is undoubtedly the worst legislation of its kind in the world.

In America, Norway, and Switzerland water power is found generally under favourable conditions, that is with a high fall, which means that a large power can be obtained from a comparatively small quantity of water, and that the constructional work, piping, and turbines, are correspondingly small and low in cost. In Italy most of the power is obtained, under less favourable conditions, from rivers. A fall must in these cases be artificially created by running a canal along the river bank with a less gradient than that of the river, and many miles of canal may be needed to give a sufficient fall. In such circumstances the capital cost of the hydraulic plant may be very large, and the annual capital charges may more than counterbalance the saving in fuel, except where the load factor is high or fuel expensive. In England and Scotland, where coal is cheap, where water power rights on any river would have to be purchased, and where it would be almost impracticable to obtain way-leaves for a canal at reasonable prices, the use of water power is generally out of the question, and the fact that only a few waterfalls are utilised is not in any way due, as is often imagined, to lack of knowledge or initiative on the part of British engineers.

The utilisation of wave power and tidal motion calls for consideration only because, like the sea serpent, it appears from time to time in the newspapers and excites popular imagination. The power is there, and there is no engineering difficulty in utilising it; only, the capital cost would be so enormous that the annual interest charges would be many times the cost of steam or gas power. An example will serve to show this. Taking the most favourable position on our coast, the minimum difference between high and low tide levels which must be the basis for a steady supply of power is only 20 feet. Suppose that at high tide the sea is let into a reservoir 3 feet deep, and, consequently, with a bottom

17 feet above low-tide level. Turbines are supplied from this reservoir during the period when the tide is low enough to give a 6 feet fall, namely for $4\frac{1}{4}$ hours during the ebb, with an average fall of $12\frac{1}{4}$ feet, and $3\frac{1}{3}$ hours during the rise, with an average fall of $13\frac{3}{4}$ feet. If the reservoir were 1000 feet square, holding 20,000,000 gallons of water, the average horse-power available in the water over $7\frac{1}{2}$ hours out of 12 would be 1300. Turbines with so low and variable a fall would not have an efficiency of more than 70 per cent., giving 900 horse-power. The power would have to be supplied to a battery of accumulators to equalise it over the twelve hours, and the steady power obtainable would be 520 electrical horse-power giving 3,000,000 electrical units of energy a year. A reservoir 1000 feet square, constructed so as to withstand the inrush of the sea, with the accessory construction necessary, could not, with the most favourable natural advantages in its formation, cost less than £100,000, and the total cost would be at a minimum £125,000. Reckoning interest and depreciation on this at $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., the cost per electrical unit of energy comes to three farthings for capital charges only, while steam or gas power with a similar steady load would not cost more than one farthing per unit, including all charges. This example, taken throughout from the most favourable point of view, is enough to show the impracticability of utilising tidal motion, apart from the difficulties which would arise from the reservoir and channels silting up with sand, the protection of the works from storms and many other causes.

In conclusion, a few speculations about the future may be of interest. The steam reciprocating-engine has had its day, though for small powers, where fuel economy is a secondary consideration, it will be used for many years to come. The steam turbine is at the present time making rapid progress, and, until there is a marked development in gas and Diesel engines, will hold its own for all large plants. It is doubtful, however, whether steam-turbine plant can be improved to any great extent; turbines, boilers, and accessory plant have already been brought so near perfection that only a small and gradual improvement can be expected. Gas and Diesel engines offer greater scope. Except in small sizes both are still imperfect machines and, apart from efficiency, call for improvement. There is every prospect that they

will develop more rapidly or to a greater degree than the steam turbine, and they may become the engines of the future.

It has been said that the future of Diesel engines turns largely on the price of petroleum oil fuel, but mention should be made of the other oils, by-products of the distillation of coal, which are all capable of use in Diesel engines. Coal distillation in gasworks and coke ovens is undergoing great development, and it is possible that the fuel oils derived from it may in the future increase in quantity and decrease in cost. If it ever became practicable to employ in a Diesel engine the fuel for which it was originally designed, the Diesel would soon become the sole source of power from fuel. This fuel is finely powdered coal, which forms with air an explosive mixture as if it were a gas. It is always used in this country in rotary cement kilns, and is quite capable of driving a Diesel engine ; but the presence of incombustible ash, which deposits and accumulates in the cylinder and valve passages, has proved, among others, an insurmountable difficulty.

A more probable development of the gas and Diesel engine lies in the use of the heat contained in the exhaust gases, which carry off some 24 per cent. of the total heat supplied to the engine. The gases are at comparatively low temperature, and it is therefore difficult to make efficient use of them, but the generation of steam in boilers heated by the gases has already met with some success.

The only new machine on the horizon is the gas turbine, a machine to combine the advantages of the steam turbine with the high efficiency of the gas engine. Gas turbines have been made, but only with minute efficiency. High efficiency means high temperature, and to run a turbine in an atmosphere of high-temperature gas seems at present hopeless ; but it is not a problem that should be called impossible.

G. H. Baillie.

THE COMPULSORY SETTLEMENT OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

1. **Memoranda relating to the text and operation of laws affecting Strikes and Lock-outs.** Cd. 6081. 1912.
2. **United States Bulletin of Labour.** No. 98. 1912.
3. **Industrial Warfare.** By C. WATNEY and J. A. LITTLE. John Murray. 1912.
4. **Report on the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act of Canada, 1907.** By Sir GEORGE ASKWITH. Cd. 6603. 1913.
5. **Report of Industrial Council on Enquiry into Industrial Agreements.** Cd. 6952. 1913.
6. **Evidence taken before the Industrial Council in connection with the Enquiry into Industrial Agreements.** Cd. 6953. 1913.

IN the United Kingdom there is nothing illegal in a strike *per se*—that is, in a simultaneous cessation of work by work-people consequent on a dispute as to wages and conditions of employment; and so long as such illegal elements as intimidation, violence, or breach of contract are not introduced into a strike, the law cannot be invoked against strikers. In the same way, in the United States and France, except in a few unimportant cases, complete freedom to strike exists. But the grave inconvenience and loss which have been caused to the community in recent years by a series of widespread and prolonged strikes have raised the question whether the State should not attempt compulsorily to settle industrial disputes and place restrictions upon freedom to strike and lock-out. It is true that even where complete freedom to strike or lock-out is given by the law, it may be taken away in exceptional cases by *ad hoc* legislation or executive action. The Coal Mines (Minimum Wage) Act, for example, which ended the English coal strike of 1912, though based upon the agreement of the parties, contained compulsory elements; and the calling up of the reserves during the French railway strike of 1910, to make the men perform as soldiers duties they had refused to do as railway employees, was a marked restriction on freedom to strike. *Ad hoc* measures such as these, however,

are open to grave objections. They are invoked, not to prevent a strike taking place, but to end one already declared, and this at a time when a great deal of mischief has been done; they are applied as a rule in times of panic, and, like all action at such times, are liable to look only to present considerations —the necessity of ending the strike—and to ignore important ulterior consequences; and they tend to produce an acute sense of grievance on one or both sides, for at such times feeling runs high and is uncontrolled by reason. Thus, in order that intervention may be successful the State has to make a strong show of authority, to the point of using its military forces, and though in some cases *ad hoc* action by the State may give the parties an excuse for making peace, in general it is both expensive and inadequate. It is important, therefore, to consider whether it is possible and desirable to place permanent restrictions on freedom to strike or lock-out which would be both more effective and less costly than *ad hoc* interference.

There is ample precedent for such a course in the practice of European States, of the Australasian Colonies, and of Canada and the Transvaal.

In these countries the laws which restrict freedom to strike or lock-out fall into two main groups, according to the aim which they have in view. The injury done by a strike or lock-out consists partly of the loss falling upon the disputants themselves, together with the evil involved in the breaking of social peace; and partly of the burden thrown upon consumers, including persons engaged in other industries, by the interruption in the supply of a particular article. Thus a law may be primarily intended to regulate the relations of parties to an industrial dispute in their own interest by introducing the rule of law into the settlement of their quarrels; or it may be intended to secure continuity of service to the public. As a rule, existing laws embrace both these aims, but in practice one or other is predominant.

The most important laws primarily designed to secure continuity of service to the public are to be found in various European States, in Canada, and in the Transvaal; while the laws which primarily seek to regulate industrial relations are to be found in the Australasian Colonies. Formerly, the penal codes of the leading European States made it illegal for work-

people or employers to combine for the purpose of enforcing demands connected with wages and conditions of employment by means of strikes and lock-outs. The repeal in 1864 by France of the Articles in her Code to this effect was the forerunner of repeal in other continental States, and freedom to combine for the purpose of striking and locking-out has now been formally or tacitly conceded. In some countries, however, this freedom is still restricted in the case of persons engaged in certain industries. In Germany, Austria, and Belgium stringent control is exercised over combinations of employees in the post office, telephone, telegraph, and railway services, and in Germany undertakings carried on by State or local authorities have been held by the Courts not to be ' industrial ' and therefore not to fall within the sections of the Imperial Code which specifically grant freedom to strike. The general principle of administration in these three countries is that those engaged in the public service or upon railways must give up their freedom to combine for improving wages and conditions of employment. In Germany, rules for admission to the public service are laid down, which practically prevent an employee belonging to a union not approved of by the authorities, and membership of such a body makes it very difficult to attain the coveted status of a *Beamter* (official). The Federal and State Railway administrations not only require to be informed of proposals by the staff to form a trade union, but, when it comes into existence, supervise its by-laws and meetings, and so effective is this regulation that 90 per cent. of the organised railway servants of Germany belong to unions, the by-laws of which specifically waive the right to strike. In Belgium there is similar supervision of combinations of employees in the postal, telegraph, telephone, and railway services. In Austria all trade unions are required to send copies of their by-laws to the political authorities, and if these are considered ' dangerous or illegal ' the union is either dissolved or its formation is prohibited, the administration of the law being especially stringent in the case of the public services and railways.

There is little doubt that the policy of these three countries has been successful in its object, but the scope for its application is clearly very limited. The history of laws against combination shows clearly that the restriction can only be

made effective by giving some *quid pro quo* to the employees in the form of more favourable terms of employment than obtain elsewhere. These differential advantages increase the reluctance of workpeople to jeopardise their employment by disobedience to rules and, if a strike does take place, diminish the solidarity of the strikers and make it easier to replace them. In practice, however, such advantages can only be given in State-controlled industries, and it is therefore only in these that effective regulation of combination can take place. But the more widely industry is nationalised, the more expensive does it become to give these differential advantages, while in cases where freedom to combine is highly valued they would have to be greatly increased. Continental experience therefore gives no warrant for the view that nationalisation of industry coupled with restrictions on freedom to combine affords a solution of the strike problem. In Germany, Austria, and Belgium the social prestige attaching to State employment keeps the cost of controlling combination within reasonable limits; but where, as in English-speaking countries, State service is less esteemed and freedom to combine is more valued, the inducement to surrender this freedom would have to take the form of much higher wages or much shorter hours. In this country, therefore, though strict supervision of combination among State employees would probably lessen the risk of their striking, its expense might outweigh any advantages secured.

The laws of European States which directly prohibit strikes and lock-outs, though numerous, are unimportant and have been little used. In Italy, strikes of railway employees are forbidden unconditionally under penalty of degradation, dismissal, or loss of superannuation benefit; but the value of the law has never been tested, and it is generally believed that the sanction for observance is quite inadequate. In Belgium, in addition to the laws restricting freedom to combine, strikes of railway employees and other civil servants are forbidden, but the general observance of this law is said to be due not to the penalties it imposes, but to reluctance to risk the loss of State employment. The railway strike of 1903 in Holland led to the passage of an Act imposing penalties on railway employees concerned in a strike, but the concessions made in 1903 have prevented any serious unrest and the law has never

been invoked. In Russia, strikes are forbidden in 'undertakings 'having a social or governmental character,' but in practice, the suppression of strikes has been secured by the executive action of the police. The laws of Spain and Portugal both require a minimum period of notice to be given before a strike is declared which will affect the supply of necessaries such as light, water, and railway services, but recent industrial disturbances in those countries have been met, not by the law but by the use of the military; and the law of the Canton of Geneva which forbids suspension of work in order to modify an award of the Wages Board set up by the law has no penalty attached, and is therefore nothing more than a pious expectation.

More interesting than these laws, but chiefly of value as an example of what to avoid, is the doctrine laid down by some of the United States Courts that a strike is illegal if it is declared to gratify a malicious motive or to secure unreasonable or unfair ends. Administration of the law on these lines has proved impracticable. As a famous English judge remarked, 'The Devil 'himself knoweth not the hearts of men'; and in the absence of any satisfactory external test of motive, or of reasonableness and fairness, a law against strikes based on differences of motive or intention is almost bound to be unworkable. For this reason, the suggestion often made that prohibitions of strikes should be limited to those intended to 'hold up' society cannot be regarded as practical politics, for though it may be argued that strikes involving several industries simultaneously have this object, in fact they may be aimed solely at employers, while a sectional strike may well be directed against society as a whole.*

The only laws directly prohibiting strikes and lock-outs, of which experience can be regarded as at all useful, are those of the English Colonies, and these therefore claim somewhat detailed consideration. The law passed in Canada in 1907 served both in aim and machinery as a model for the Transvaal Act of 1909, and the two may therefore be conveniently described together. Their chief object is undoubtedly to secure continuity of service in certain important industries, but they differ from European laws in that they also aim at settling

* For example, the strike of the French miners at Carmaux in 1891 to obtain manhood suffrage.

industrial disputes in a way satisfactory to the parties. Their method is prohibition of strikes and lock-outs pending investigation of the quarrel by the State. The Canadian law applies only to mining, agencies of transportation or communication, and public services such as railways and light, water and power works. Railways are not covered by the Transvaal Act, but the Governor-General has power to extend the Act to any undertaking or trade other than those it specifically mentions. Investigation is carried out by a Board of Conciliation and Investigation appointed by the Minister for Labour on the application of either of the parties to an industrial dispute, or in the case of railway disputes in Canada, on the Minister's own initiative. This Board consists of three persons, two of whom are recommended by, or are representative of, the parties, the third being an impartial chairman. It is the duty of the Board to conduct a public inquiry into the dispute and to publish a report with recommendations. Pending inquiry and report strikes and lock-outs are forbidden, under penalty of fine in Canada, and of fine and imprisonment in the Transvaal. This prohibition is operative even if no application for a Board is made by either of the parties.

In the laws of the Australasian Colonies, the regulation of the relations of employers and employed with regard to wages, hours of labour, apprenticeship, and other industrial matters occupies a prominent place. The law of Victoria, in fact, is concerned almost entirely with this regulation by means of a Wages Board in each trade covered by the law, and deals only indirectly with strikes. Under the law of 1907, however, if the Minister for Labour is satisfied that an organised strike or lock-out is about to take place, or has been declared, in a trade, subject to a Wages Board determination, he may suspend the determination wholly or in part. The law is thus based upon the assumption that State regulation of industrial relations is valued by the parties, and its suspension is a hardship to be avoided. In South Australia, the only strikes and lock-outs prohibited are those on account of any matter in respect of which a Wages Board has made a determination, the penalty consisting of a fine. The trades to which the Act applies are of such character as to make it clear that the purpose of the Act is regulation of the wage-bargain, for no 'public utility' is included; but the Governor may, with

the approval of the Houses of Parliament, appoint a Wages Board in any trade, in addition to those specified in the Act.

In the Acts of New Zealand, New South Wales, Western Australia, and the Commonwealth, there is direct recognition of the claims of the public, though restrictions on strikes and lock-outs are closely connected with elaborate machinery in the form of Conciliation Boards and Arbitration Courts for fixing wages, hours, and conditions of employment. Under the New Zealand Act of 1894, the first legislation of its kind in Australasia, a strike or lock-out was illegal and punishable by fine after one party to a dispute had appealed to a Conciliation Board or to the Arbitration Court set up by the Act and while the proceedings before these bodies were pending, or if it took place in violation of an award made by the Court. As the Boards and Court could only be approached by 'industrial unions' voluntarily formed and registered under the Act, the prohibition of strikes and lock-outs applied, with some unimportant exceptions, only to those who in the first place of their own free will came under the law. Essentially, this voluntary basis of the law has been retained in New Zealand, and has been emphasised in the Consolidating Acts of 1908 by the provision of more efficient Conciliation Boards to which reference is obligatory before approaching the Arbitration Court. But in the same Act it is made illegal in any case to strike or lock-out in industries which supply such articles as water, coal, milk, and transport services unless fourteen days' notice is given, and in this way interruption in the supply of an important commodity has been recognised as a ground for prohibiting strikes and lock-outs. In New South Wales the series of Acts from 1901 to 1912 all prohibit strikes and lock-outs, and since 1912 this prohibition applies to all industries; but since 1908 the single Arbitration Court for regulating industrial relations has been replaced by a network of Wages Boards on the Victorian model with appeal to an Industrial Court, and by this machinery industrial relations are controlled in great detail. An Act of 1909 imposed specially heavy penalties for instigating or taking part in a strike which affected transport services or the supply of a 'necessary commodity' as defined by the Act, but the 1912 Act repealed these special provisions and replaced them

by a general prohibition of 'restraining the trade' in a 'necessary' commodity.

The law of Western Australia and the law of the Commonwealth both prohibit strikes unconditionally. The former is closely modelled on the earlier New Zealand Act, and has elaborate machinery for regulating industrial relations, though in practice the Arbitration Court has been the main tribunal. The Commonwealth Act of 1904, amended in 1910, applies only to disputes extending beyond the limits of any one State, but within these limits applies to every type of industry. The chief aim of the Act, however, has been to control industrial relations by means of the single Arbitration Court it establishes, for though no strikes have been officially recognised as in contravention of the Act, and the power of the Court on its own motion in the public interest to take cognizance of disputes has never been exercised, awards have been delivered regulating the conditions of employment in several important industries.

Whatever be the aim and form of a law which prohibits strikes and lock-outs, experience everywhere points to the conclusion that there must exist, side by side with the prohibition, machinery for achieving the ends of a strike and lock-out. In other words, restrictions on freedom to strike have as their necessary complement the regulation by the State of wages and conditions of employment. In Europe, though the laws apply only to a few industries in which special privileges can be given, in all cases where the law is not a dead letter channels are provided for bringing grievances before the authorities; in Canada and the Transvaal, public inquiry and report are given; and in Australasia, every law sets up a system of Conciliation or Wages Boards and Arbitration Courts. Moreover, the more complete the prohibition of strikes and lock-outs the more completely is the determination of wages and conditions of employment taken out of the hands of employers and employed, and therefore the more elaborate and far-reaching must be the regulation of industrial relations. The difficulty and thanklessness of this undertaking are shown by Australasian experience. The idea that there is a body of industrial common law which it is merely the business of the Arbitration Court to define and declare, has proved illusory, and in practice the State has to settle the wage-bargain.

Involving as this does the determination of both piece and time wages for all classes of labour, including the young and inefficient, the fixing of hours of labour, including overtime, and the control of apprenticeship, it has led on to the responsibility of the State for finding employment on the decreed conditions, to the extension of awards throughout a district or industry in order to equalise competition, and to the necessity of enforcing observance of the decisions of the Court. Evidently, therefore, in a developed industrial community, regulation by the State of industrial relations may become an almost impossible task. Again, the prohibition of strikes and lock-outs and the substitution of means for achieving their ends without their risks and hardships, directly breeds the litigious spirit. Even supporters of the Acts in New Zealand and New South Wales admit that in order to bring questions regarding conditions of employment before the Arbitration Courts, there has been a marked tendency to magnify petty grievances and to aggravate disputes ; in other words, to create some of the very difficulties which the Acts were designed to end. This use of the Courts for settling factitious quarrels is not easily prevented, for any such device as throwing all the costs on the party who brings the matter forward may lessen the incentive to peaceful settlement, and stimulate the use of other methods.

But even if the State decides to undertake the burden of regulating industrial relations, the success of a prohibition of strikes and lock-outs is not assured. The State must be able to enforce the law against recalcitrants, and in practice this has proved a difficult matter. In general, public opinion does not favour compulsory action, partly because the ' public ' in any given dispute largely consists of employers and employed who are reluctant to support measures which may later be used against themselves, and partly because there is no widespread conception of a strike or lock-out being morally wrong. In special cases no doubt public opinion is strongly in support of coercive measures, but by itself it can as a rule do little, especially as the increased localisation and centralisation of industry tends to make public opinion the same thing as the opinion of the parties to a dispute. For this reason, a penalty of some kind must be exacted, which both *a priori* reasoning and practical experience suggest must take the form of fine or imprisonment.

The suggestion that the State should throw its influence against the party to a dispute who breaks the law, by such methods as using its military or naval forces to keep an industry going or by giving a direct subsidy to the other party, is open to weighty objections and no serious attempt has been made to apply such methods. To distinguish the real offender would always be difficult ; and in any case the mode of intervention, its extent and the time at which it took place, could not be laid down in the law and would have to be left to the discretion of the executive, thus opening a door to grave charges of undue influence and partiality. Moreover, military and naval forces could not be used to carry on an industry in which there was a lock-out, and could only replace strikers in industries which employed comparatively unskilled labour. A more practicable penalty is the forfeiture of superannuation, insurance, and other benefits given by the State, or the withdrawal of special privileges given by the law. This is part of the penalty imposed by many existing laws, but has been found by itself to be quite inadequate, mainly because the payment extends over a long period, so that the deterrent effect is lessened, while ill-feeling between the parties may be perpetuated.

A third type of penalty which has many advocates is the impounding of previously deposited security. This appears to have proved successful in the case of voluntary agreements such as that regulating the English boot and shoe industry, and it formed the basis of a bill introduced by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald to secure observance of agreements between employers and employed in the Port of London. The only laws which make provision for the deposit of guarantees are those of New South Wales and the Commonwealth, where the Court on making an award may require security for observance, and that of Nova Scotia, where in the case of mining disputes the employer is required to withhold wages for fourteen days pending arbitration and then pay double the sum so withheld into a bank, this amount being forfeited to the other side if one party break the award. Up to the present, however, these provisions have not been made use of, and there is reason to doubt their value. In the first place, the administrative difficulties of securing deposit of the security are considerable and would increase with the area of operation

of the law; secondly, the efficacy of forfeiture as a penalty is open to question. The report of the Industrial Council is emphatic on this point, their opinion being that 'the general 'adoption of the system of monetary guarantees cannot be 'regarded as constituting a practicable and efficient means 'of ensuring the fulfilment of agreements.' Much less can they be expected to ensure observance of a prohibition of strikes and lock-outs which, unlike an agreement, is not the result of voluntary action by employers and employed.

The penalties of fine and imprisonment imposed by existing laws which prohibit strikes and lock-outs are scarcely more satisfactory. The difficulty of exacting fines from individual strikers is clearly shown by experience, particularly in Australasia. In New Zealand the strike now proceeding at Wellington emphasises the lesson of the past—that it is impracticable to punish effectively those who strike in defiance of the law. It is easy to say 'Punish the leaders,' but these leaders are not always easy to discover, and their punishment may irritate rather than intimidate their followers. It is true that in the great coal strike of 1909 in New South Wales, a policy of proceeding against the leaders of the strike appeared to succeed; but in this instance special legislation was necessary, and even then the men did not yield for four months. The only solution of the difficulty appears to be to make the penalty fall not upon the individual but upon organised and responsible bodies of workpeople. The Australasian States in which the prohibition of strikes is strongest, viz. New Zealand, New South Wales, Western Australia, and the Commonwealth, all take as the unit for administration of their law the 'industrial union'—a body created by the Acts for their own purposes—or the ordinary trade union, and make these primarily responsible for observance of the law, though, if necessary, proceedings may be taken against individuals. The advantage of this policy is that it brings into existence a legal person upon whom the law can lay its hands, and can punish for infringement of the law by levying execution on property and by withdrawal of privileges.

It must be recognised, however, that basing a law upon organised labour involves important consequences. In the first place, the hands of the union executive must be strengthened against the members, in order that union responsibility may

be real. In New South Wales, for example, the union is given the power of suing in the Courts for a penalty for breach of its rules. Secondly, the use of labour organisations by the State for its own purposes makes it necessary to encourage the formation of these bodies by granting special rights and privileges to their members. In Australia and New Zealand, for example, a clause is usually inserted in awards to the effect that employers are to give preference of employment to unionists. Thirdly, this policy of encouragement, unless it is to result in abuses, such as arbitrary limitation of membership in the interest of existing members of unions, must involve State control of unionism. In Australasia the policy of the 'closed shop' has had as its corollary the maintenance of the 'open door' by forbidding unions to impose high entrance-fees, subscriptions, or tests of capacity as a condition of membership; and to avoid multiplication of disputes and awards, the number of unions recognised by the law in each trade has been strictly limited, irrespective of the number of occupations covered by the trade. The result has been to weaken the economic power of trade unions proper either by changing them from comparatively homogeneous and coherent bodies of work-people into a collection of individuals whose economic interests may differ widely, or, where the industrial union recognised by the law is distinct from the trade union, by diminishing the reason for the latter's existence. On the other hand, State encouragement of labour organisation has emphasised the element of status or caste in the position of workpeople by making the industrial rights and duties of individuals dependent on their membership of a semi-corporate body recognised by the State. The consequences have been not only an impulse towards political action by work-people, but the growth of a class solidarity which has strengthened class feeling in politics by throwing increased power into the hands of organised labour.

The policy of basing a law restricting freedom to strike and lock-out upon organised labour therefore implies political and social changes of great importance, which are certainly not justified by any substantial increase in the effectiveness of the law. Experience, in fact, shows that the only real security for observance of the law is willingness on the part of work-people to submit thereto, and in practice the effective-

ness of labour laws has always been dependent upon working-class opinion towards them being favourable. In Canada, for example, the success of the 1907 Act was at first in jeopardy owing to the opposition of the powerful unions of the railwaymen and miners. Since 1907 the value of the Act in the case of railway disputes has been assured by the increasing favour with which it is regarded by railwaymen ; but the continuous hostility of the miners has made the law ineffective in dealing with mining disputes. Again, in the Transvaal the impotence of the law of 1909 in the face of the men's open contempt for it was shown during the Johannesburg tramway strike in 1911 ; and during the miners' strike on the Rand in 1913 the Act was valueless in view of the men's uncompromising attitude. Similarly in the Australasian States there is a striking coincidence between periods of working-class dislike for the law and inability to secure its observance. In New Zealand, for example, from 1896 to 1905 no strikes were officially recorded, but in 1905 murmurs against the Act developed into acute dissatisfaction, which was reflected in twelve strikes in 1907 and twelve strikes in 1908. The amending Act of 1908 removed many of the sources of grievance, and there were no strikes in 1909 and only four in 1910. Since 1910, however, feeling against the Act has developed and several serious strikes have been declared.

The close connexion between the success of a law prohibiting strikes and lock-outs and the attitude of work-people towards it makes it desirable to analyse the causes of hostility or friendliness. The most important of these are connected with the fact that no law can expect a favourable reception from workpeople unless it provides them with means of securing wages and conditions of employment at least as good as those they think they could obtain by direct action. Discrepancy between the actual terms of employment established as a result of commissions of inquiry and the decisions of Wages Boards or Arbitration Courts and those which it is believed a strike could have won, is a fruitful source of dissatisfaction with existing laws. In Canada the opposition to the law comes mainly from the miners of the West, whose unions are frankly socialist in aim and profess strong belief in the power of a strike, especially when suddenly declared. The central characteristic of the Canadian Act, however, is the

delay it imposes before a strike may be declared, delay which may run into months; and therefore the Western miner regards the law as one which deprives him of his most powerful weapon for improving his position. Thus, the fundamental principle of the Act is the root of the miners' hostility towards it. The disregard of the law in the Transvaal is clearly traceable to a widespread belief in the power of a strike and growing impatience with slower and more peaceful methods, sentiments exemplified in the manifesto of the leaders of the Rand strikers. Australasian experience teaches the same lesson. One of the chief reasons for the feeling against the 1901 Act of New South Wales was the intolerable delay in settling disputes, due to the congestion of business in the Arbitration Court, delay which led in more than one instance to unions cancelling their registration under the Act and bargaining direct with employers; and in New Zealand the strikes of 1907 and 1908 were admittedly the result of a series of decisions by the Arbitration Court unfavourable to work-people.

There are, moreover, considerable difficulties in the way of providing an alternative to a strike which will satisfy work-people; and these difficulties are most serious at the very time when the value of a strike is most highly esteemed, and consequently the need for a law prohibiting strikes is greatest. In the first place, the ingenuity of man has not yet been able to devise a form of Board or Court for making recommendations or awards which is likely to inspire complete confidence. Such a body should be both competent and impartial; in practice it is rarely possible to combine these characteristics. In view of the complicated character of modern industry, the only form of tribunal which is likely to have the necessary technical knowledge is one consisting of representatives of employers and employed, which from its very nature is a body of partisans. But even if the test of competence is rejected, it is difficult to create belief in impartiality. The judges of the Australasian Arbitration Courts, the chairmen of the Canadian Boards, and the 'impartial outsiders' who act as arbitrators in this country are frequently accused of being ineradicably, albeit unconsciously, biassed against labour. Thus, from the outset any system of regulating industrial relations operates at a disadvantage. But difficulties only

begin here. Periods of industrial depression and regard for the interests of employers and consumers prevent any tribunal from making awards or recommendations uniformly favourable to labour. But optimism and ignorance of the working of economic laws combine to create the belief among workpeople that employers and the owners of capital are squeezable to an unlimited extent, and consequently an award or recommendation which grants less than labour's full claims is apt to be suspect on the ground that direct action supported by a strike would have gained better terms. Moreover, the prohibition of strikes itself helps to foster this belief in their efficacy by preventing their value being tested by hard facts. As John Stuart Mill remarked, 'Experience of strikes has 'been the best teacher of the labouring classes on the subject of 'the relation between wages and the demand and supply of 'labour.'

The foregoing analysis of the principal conditions which determine the attitude of work-people towards laws which restrict freedom to strike and lock-out serves to explain fluctuations of opinion in the United Kingdom regarding such legislation. With the growth of the trade union movement among unskilled workpeople at the end of the eighties, the old trade union distrust of political action as a practicable method of mending industrial conditions was replaced by the belief that control of legislation would enable labour to reorganise the social structure on collectivist lines and abolish the economic evils which oppressed it. This faith in the power of political action was stimulated by the discredit into which direct action fell, owing to the failure of several important strikes during the nineties, and was reflected in the growth of organisation for increasing the representation of labour in Parliament. The effect of this movement upon the attitude towards legislative restrictions on strikes and lock-outs is seen in the votes on a series of resolutions in favour of such restrictions introduced into the Trade Union Congress by Mr. Ben Tillett. The test invariably applied by speakers on the resolutions was a comparison of the wages and conditions obtainable by direct action and by legislative or administrative regulation. Up to 1905 the majorities against the resolutions became smaller and smaller. The representatives of the strong trade unions were consistently hostile, urging that the strike was too

valuable a weapon to be given up, that terms of employment would be settled by courts biassed against labour, and that trade unions would be weakened. Support for the proposals came from the weaker unions on the ground that strikes could not be organised in badly paid industries, had proved of little value in the past, and that wages and conditions of employment were bound to be improved by State regulation. Since 1905, however, opinion in the Congress has become more and more unfavourable to restrictions in any shape or form on freedom to strike. Owing largely to disappointment at the result of Labour representation in Parliament, the influence of which is considered to have been seriously weakened by the Osborne judgment, faith in legislative action has declined. The working of the Arbitration Acts of Australia and New Zealand has been seen to arouse dissatisfaction among work-people in those countries, and a bitter and able opponent of such measures who has witnessed their operation has appeared in the person of Mr. Tom Mann. On the other hand, the unskilled labour unions have become wealthier, better organised and more militant, and their leaders show a strong leaning towards Syndicalism. It is not therefore surprising to find that, not only in the Trade Union Congress but in most of the evidence given before the Industrial Council, the strongest feeling is expressed against any restriction upon freedom to strike. The opposition is not to voluntary arbitration or conciliation, but to depriving labour of what is regarded as its most powerful weapon in the last resort. The strength of this opposition may be gauged by the feeling aroused by Mr. Crooks' Bill on the lines of the Canadian Act introduced in 1911 into the House of Commons. Not only did the Trade Union Congress protest against this action, but declared that 'we will by every means in our power resist 'every attempt to prevent or hinder the right of workers to 'strike at any time when they consider such action necessary.'

The feeling in Great Britain against restrictions on freedom to strike shows no tendency to decline : on the contrary, such evidence as there is points to its becoming stronger. It has been suggested that the difficulty could be surmounted by limiting the operation of a restrictive law to trades which voluntarily submit to it, somewhat on the lines of the New Zealand law. Such a policy, however, offers little or no

advantage over existing methods of securing industrial peace, while throwing a burden upon the State. There is no reason to suppose that the industries coming under the law, which would presumably be those in which labour organisations were weak or in which sweating was common, would also be those in which a continuous supply of their product is essential to public welfare. The law of New Zealand has in fact had to recognise this, and by forbidding strikes without notice in certain industries has to some extent thrown over the principle of voluntary submission. One last argument of those who support restrictions on strikes and lock-outs must, however, not be neglected. It is urged that the mere fact of the law being on the Statute Book may arouse opinion in its favour, and thus on the one hand strengthen the hands of the State in enforcing the law and on the other diminish the need for enforcement. This argument neglects the influence of a law which obviously fails in attaining its ends in turning opinion against the principle on which it is based, and in weakening the authority both of the legislature and the executive.

The general conclusion is, therefore, that in present circumstances any attempt to prevent strikes and lock-outs by coercive measures would be unwise; and that the only sure foundation for industrial peace is the growth of mutual respect and good-will between employers and employed, together with the recognition by both of their obligations toward the organised society of which they form a part.

W. G. CONSTABLE.

THE NEW MONROISM

1. **Die Monroedoktrin, in ihren Beziehungen zur amerikanischen Diplomatie und zum Völkerrecht.** By Dr. jur. HERBERT KRAUS. Berlin. 1913.
2. **Monroïsme? Notes-études sur la politique continentale américaine à l'égard de l'Europe.** By F. CAPELLA Y PONS, Docteur en droit. Paris. 1913.
3. **Some original documents on the genesis of the Monroe Doctrine.** By WORTHINGTON C. FORD. Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Second Series. Vol. XV. 1901, 1902.

ON the 31st of March of last year, a little more than a month after the *coup d'état* which overthrew President Madero and ended in his murder, the British Government formally recognised General Huerta as President *ad interim* of Mexico. This was done, as the Prime Minister explained in his speech at the Guildhall banquet on the 10th of November, first, because Great Britain had herself neither the will nor the power to intervene, and was therefore bound to deal, as she would do in the case of any Central or South American State, with whatever might be for the time being the *de facto* Government; secondly, because, according to the information then obtainable, 'there appeared to be no element except that of 'General Huerta and his supporters which offered any prospect 'of the restoration of stability and order.' A proceeding so proper in itself, and so perfectly in accord with the traditional British policy in similar cases, would have needed no apology in the face of instructed foreign opinion. But opinion in the United States, so far as the principles of international relations are concerned, is anything but instructed, and—again to quote Mr. Asquith—'a rumour found credence in some quarters 'that, at a moment when the Government of the United 'States were taking a line of their own with regard to Mexico, 'we entered upon a new departure of policy deliberately, or at 'least if not deliberately, at any rate in effect, opposed to that 'of the United States and calculated to thwart it.'

Had the Prime Minister been more explicit as to the contents

of this 'rumour' he would probably have been compelled to use language which would have tended to defeat his immediate object, that of soothing the ruffled feelings of the American public by proving once more how completely Great Britain is prepared to subordinate her own views, so far as the two Americas are concerned, to those of Washington. For the rumours in question took a form by no means flattering to the British Government, which was, and in certain quarters still is, accused of having hurriedly recognised General Huerta in return for an undertaking on his part to support certain large British industrial and commercial interests in Mexico against their American rivals, whose hopes had been based on the favour of the fallen Government of President Madero. That this country, from so base a motive, should pursue a policy 'calculated to thwart' the disinterested aims of the United States, very naturally exasperated American opinion. The friendly feeling towards Great Britain which during recent years has shown so gratifying a development received a sudden check: on platforms and in the Press the outcry was loud against the 'unfriendly act' of which the British Government had been guilty; and in the lobbies of the Capitol at Washington there was open talk of reprisals in the future.

Clearly the Prime Minister was in the right to take advantage of the occasion of the Guildhall banquet to correct so patent a misconception of our policy; and American susceptibilities should have been sufficiently calmed by his plain *exposé* of its motives and by his explicit declaration that 'there is not a 'vestige of foundation' for the 'rumour' referred to. But in his desire to emphasise the perfect cordiality of the diplomatic relations between this country and the United States, Mr. Asquith used language which seemed to commit Great Britain, not only to an attitude of friendly neutrality towards the United States in respect of its Mexican policy, but to a general approval of any means which the Government of Washington might in the future adopt in order to carry this policy into effect.

'Our diplomatic relations with the United States [he said] have for a long time been such that, with the freest and frankest discussions of all matters that may from time to time arise, we both feel the fullest assurance that nothing can happen to disturb

our common resolve to attain and maintain a friendly and sympathetic understanding.'

This declaration, which might otherwise have passed for no more than a general expression of good-will, received a peculiar significance from the publication in 'The Times' of Nov. 11—the very day on which the report of Mr. Asquith's speech appeared—of an 'Authoritative Statement' of the United States point of view. Of this statement, coming 'from a quarter eminently qualified to interpret the attitude 'of the United States in the dispute with Mexico, and in par-'ticular to explain the motives of President Wilson,' it is not too much to say that it puts forward new principles, or rather revives old principles, of the most fateful import for the future of international relations. The following are the essential passages :

'The underlying motive of his [President Wilson's] action is not merely a desire to vindicate what the French call *le droit de voisinage*—that is to say, the expediency of restoring order in a country bordering for thousands of miles upon the territory of the United States. His motive is rather the vindication of the principle of representative and constitutional government.

The policy hitherto followed of recognising as President of the Mexican Republic any man who might succeed, by force or otherwise, in imposing his authority upon the country, is felt to have been mistaken, inasmuch as it placed a premium on revolutionary outbreaks and seemed to promise international recognition to any successful adventurer. If it be clearly understood, not only in Mexico but in other Central and Southern American Republics, that a successful adventurer is not sure of recognition, a check will be placed upon revolutionary initiative and it will be demonstrated that the United States can only regard as the constitutional head of any American community a man who enjoys the support, properly expressed and registered, of a majority of his enfranchised fellow citizens.

Idealistic and unpractical though this principle may be deemed in some parts of Europe, it is one on which the people of the United States are earnestly agreed. Should it not be feasible to secure its application in Mexico otherwise than by force of arms, force will inevitably be employed; and when the United States Army shall have vindicated the principle, Mexico will be left to govern itself in accordance with the constitutional precepts which it will be the duty of the Army to inculcate.'

On the day following the publication of this statement, the 'six points' of the policy formulated by President Wilson

were published at Washington.* In general the policy thus defined was identical with that indicated in the Statement, with a more explicit exposition of the methods by which practical effect was to be given to it. It will be sufficient here to quote only the first and fourth of these 'points,' which cover the whole principle involved:

'1. The United States will insist on the elimination of General Huerta and all those closely associated with him from the control of public affairs, and to secure this end will spare no effort and will invade Mexico if necessary.'

4. When the elimination of General Huerta has been obtained, efforts will be directed to inducing someone acceptable to both parties to assume the provisional Presidency under the protection of the United States.'

From the sequence of dates it is clear that the end of President Wilson's first period of 'hesitation' was hastened by Mr. Asquith's speech, and the deduction is natural that the policy defined in the 'six points,' together with the abstract and revolutionary principles upon which this policy is based, have after the 'freest and frankest discussion' obtained the approval of His Majesty's Government. Such at any rate has been the general assumption, and the effects are likely to be far-reaching. The least permanent of these effects is, it may be hazarded, the impression produced by the Prime Minister's utterance on opinion in the United States. That this fresh proof of the complacency of Great Britain, in all matters which the elastic principles of the Monroe Doctrine may be stretched to cover, should be highly gratifying to American sentiment is natural enough; and, if Mr. Asquith's sole aim was to conciliate this sentiment, he met with an immediate measure of success. The question is how long this gratifying impression will last; and, to judge by precedent, it may be expected to last just so long as Great Britain is prepared, whenever a difference of opinion arises between the United States and herself, to subordinate her own views and interests. At best, then, it is extremely doubtful whether the unqualified approval of the policy of the White House, implied in the Prime Minister's language, will have any permanent influence in cementing that 'union of hearts'

* The Times, Nov. 13, 1913.

which we all earnestly desire between the British and American nations.

What is not doubtful is the disastrous effect which the maintenance of this implied attitude will have on the sentiment of the Latin-American nations towards this country. Nor is this consideration to be lightly regarded. Our business interests, both actual and prospective, in these countries are enormous; and in spite of the failure of our diplomacy to keep pace with that of other nations, the long tradition of our political friendship with the Latin-American republics has hitherto, save in rare and comparatively insignificant instances, been unbroken. Latin-Americans have hitherto made a clear distinction between the British and the North Americans, and of late years their friendship for Great Britain has tended to increase with the growth of a contrary feeling towards the United States, and it is this fact which has done not a little to inspire the clamour of North American interests against British enterprises in South America. It is not without reason, then, that many British men of business with large interests in Latin America fear that Mr. Asquith's apparently whole-hearted endorsement of President Wilson's attitude may obliterate the distinction and attract to us some of the Latin-American dislike and suspicion of the aggressive 'Yanqui.'

Of the existence and rapid development of this dislike and suspicion no one acquainted with the trend of opinion in the Latin-American republics can be ignorant. In part, doubtless, it is due to racial antagonism and a fundamental difference of point of view and of manners. But this conflict of temperaments is not the main cause of the growing antagonism in Latin America to 'the great Republic of the North.' This must be sought in the recent developments of the Monroe Doctrine, which is rapidly being changed from an expression of the recognised principle of the right of self-defence, formulated for the benefit of all the American States, into a principle of aggression and domination, to be exploited in favour of the United States alone. Such is the opinion of the Uruguayan diplomatist Señor Capella y Pons, who in his 'Monroïsme' presents the South American point of view with singular insight and moderation, distinguishing between the true and false Doctrine, and pleading for its exact definition by

common consent, in order to restore the shaken confidence of the Latin-American republics in the underlying motives of the recent policy of the United States. Such, too, is the opinion of the German scholar Dr. Kraus, whose recently published monograph 'Die Monroedoktrin' is the most exhaustive historical and critical study that has ever appeared on the subject.* In order, then, to understand the significance of President Wilson's attitude towards the Mexican question, and of Mr. Asquith's approval of it, it is necessary to know something of the history of the Monroe Doctrine: the motive of its promulgation, its original contents, the changes it has undergone since 1823, and their causes. It will be shown that the Monroe Doctrine in its latest developments is not only a principle subversive of all the established foundations of international law, but also presents, in the flat contradiction between its primitive and present tendencies, one of the most singular ironies of history.

To make this point clear, it is necessary to carry the inquest further back into the origins of the Monroe Doctrine than has hitherto been done by those who have dealt with this subject. It is true, as Dr. Kraus says, that the Message of President Monroe was immediately inspired by the alarms excited in the United States, first by the *ukaz* of the Emperor Alexander I. of the 21st of September 1821, which declared all the north-west coast lands of North America, as far south as fifty-one degrees of latitude, to be Russian territory, and secondly, by the suggestion brought forward at the Congress of Verona in November 1822, and repeated after the success of the French intervention in Spain in 1823, that a Congress should be summoned in order to arrange a concerted intervention in the struggle between Spain and her revolted colonies in America. It may be suspected, however, that these alarms were a pretext for the declaration of an exclusive policy long powerfully backed in the United States, rather than the motive for an attitude provoked by a temporary danger. In what, indeed, did the danger consist? The Russian *ukaz*,

* See also the Peruvian diplomatist F. Garcia Calderón's 'Latin America' (Eng. transl. 1913), p. 302. 'The Monroe Doctrine has undergone an essential transformation; it has passed successively from the defensive to intervention and thence to the offensive'

which in any case only affected territories still remote from the western frontier of the United States, was a mere *brutum fulmen* in view of the refusal of Great Britain, then undisputed mistress of the seas, to acknowledge its validity; and in effect the controversy aroused by it was quickly limited to a dispute as to the Russian claim to declare the Behring Sea a *mare clausum*. As for the proposed intervention of the 'Holy Alliance' in the affairs of Latin America, the whole tenour of the diplomatic discussions, from Aix-la-Chapelle onwards, should have made it clear that even the inner group of reactionary Powers did not regard such intervention as possible without the co-operation of Great Britain and even of the United States themselves.* Now Great Britain had from the first protested against the whole principle of intervention as defined by the celebrated Troppau Protocol in 1821. She had, moreover, special reasons for objecting to the particular application of this principle in the case of the Spanish-American colonies, and her objection had been the main motive for her breach with the Continental Allies at the Congress of Verona. If, then, the security and integrity of the United States, and the desire to guard the Americas against the domination of the European Alliance, had been the sole aims of the Government at Washington, these could have been at once assured by accepting Canning's original proposal to issue, in the names of the British and United States Governments, a joint warning of 'Hands off!' That this proposal was not accepted is significant. It is possible, indeed, to understand the negative attitude of Richard Rush, the American Minister in London, to whom the proposal was in the first instance made. Rush was a doctrinaire republican, and was outraged by Canning's view that monarchy was the type of government best suited to the Latin-American nations; he noted that Great Britain had acted for years in general harmony with the European Alliance; that her motives in the matter of the Spanish colonies were purely 'selfish'; and he concluded that, her own interests secured, she would once more join in the

* These discussions, of which the record is preserved in the Foreign Office archives, were dealt with in the lectures, on the Confederation of Europe, delivered last May before the University of Oxford by the present writer.

conspiracy of monarchs against liberty.* His suspicions found an echo at Washington, where Canning was held to be a master of Machiavellian statecraft. Yet it is clear that it was no mere distrust of British motives that decided the Government of the United States to act alone, but rather the determination to assert a principle to which Great Britain would never have given her consent—the principle, that is to say, of the isolation of the Americas. Thus it came that the Monroe Doctrine was established on two underlying principles: those of 'non-intervention' and 'non-colonisation.'

Now, it was one thing to lay down the rule that 'no European 'Power or combination of Powers shall forcibly deprive an 'American State of the right and power of self-government and 'of shaping for itself its own political fortunes and destinies'; † it was another thing to proclaim that the American continents, of which vast spaces were still unoccupied, were 'henceforth 'not to be considered as subjects for future colonisation by any 'European Powers.' To the first of these propositions Great Britain could cordially assent; indeed, 'its pronouncement by 'the Monroe Administration at that particular time was un-'questionably due to the inspiration of Great Britain.' ‡ The second, enormously more far-reaching in its consequences, was one with which, in the circumstances of the time, it was impossible for Great Britain to agree.§ That it involved a principle in conflict with all the canons of international law, Dr. Kraus has no difficulty in proving; but it was in fact less a declaration of principle than of policy, and its validity depended in the long run on the power of the United States to enforce it. More than nine years earlier, Count Pozzo di Borgo, the Russian Ambassador in Paris, had noted the existence of this policy and foreseen its later developments. 'The conclusion of this important matter is uncertain,' he

* Richard Rush to President Monroe, Sept. 15, 1823. Mass. Hist. Soc. Proceedings, second series, vol. xv. p. 420.

† Secretary Olney's 'Instruction' of July 20, 1895. In Kraus, Anhang No. 8, p. 438.

‡ *Ibid.*

§ Professor Woolsey, in his article on the Monroe Doctrine in the Enc. Brit., 11th ed., says that 'with this message Great Britain was in hearty agreement.' This is certainly not true of the 'non-colonisation' principle, as Stapleton in his 'Life of Canning' made clear.

wrote to Count Nesselrode in August 1814, during the progress of the peace negotiations between Great Britain and the United States. 'The dominant party in America, which desired the 'war, is aiming at a complete revolution in the relations of the 'New World and the Old, by the destruction of all European 'interests in the American continent. Will the fact that Great 'Britain has a free hand stop this plan? I said all this in 'England, which takes short views, but was not believed.' *

In seeking to bring the Americas within the sphere of influence of the Great Alliance, the motives of European statesmen were by no means necessarily 'reactionary.' The 'Holy 'Alliance' itself, in the mind of its originator, the Emperor Alexander I. of Russia, was conceived as a 'universal union' for the purpose of preserving peace; and his whole attitude, from the debates at Aix-la-Chapelle to the abortive negotiations conducted in 1823 with the Government at Washington through Baron de Tuyll,† proved that, even during his later reactionary period, the Tsar had sufficient of his early republican principles left not to shrink from admitting the United States to the councils of the Allies, if by this means the general interests of the world's peace might be served. It cannot indeed be pretended that the motives underlying this attitude were altogether pure and disinterested. The 'two souls' of the Alliance are perhaps best revealed in the language of the Duc de Richelieu at Aix-la-Chapelle. The United States, he urged, should be invited to co-operate with the Allies, partly to gain time, partly 'in order to attach the United States 'to the general system of Europe and to prevent a spirit of 'rivalry and hatred establishing itself between the Old and 'the New World.' ‡

It is one of the ironies of the situation that these well-meant advances of the Emperor Alexander hastened the realisation of that which it was his object to avoid. President Monroe himself had welcomed the idea of co-operation with

---

* Paris, July 28 to August 9, 1814. Polovtsov, 'Correspondance des Ambassadeurs de Russie,' etc. Imp. Russ. Ist. Obsch. 112. p. 60.

† The documents are given by Mr. Worthington Ford in the 'Mass. Hist. Soc. Proceedings,' loc. cit.

‡ F.O. Records. Continent. Aix. Castlereagh. Nov. 1818. In Castlereagh to Bathurst. No. 48.

Great Britain, and had even been prepared to send American representatives to a European Congress. The chief opponent of this policy was the Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, and it was the language of the Russian despatches, with their lofty assumption of the divine right of universal intervention, which gave him the opportunity of 'speaking out.' The result may be summed up in the words of Mr. Ford:

'The evidence . . . [he says] all tends to show that it was Adams alone who gave tone to the discussions in the Cabinet on the Canning propositions, and it was due to his efforts that the question passed from that of a combination, more or less defined, with Great Britain for her own interested views and aims, to that of a general and independent policy, distinctively American, and broad enough to bear the heavy burdens laid upon it since.' *

Thus were laid, in the Message of President Monroe to Congress of December 2, 1823, the foundations of that exclusive principle of 'America for the Americans,' the idea of which, as altered and expanded from generation to generation, is connoted by the phrase 'the Monroe Doctrine.' In order to understand the present position created by the attitude of President Wilson, it will be necessary briefly to trace the subsequent developments of that idea.

At the outset it must be borne in mind that the principles laid down in the Monroe Message were not wholly one-sided in their application. The physical barrier placed by the ocean between Europe and the Americas was assumed to justify a complete separation of their interests; and if the United States threatened to regard as an 'unfriendly act' any attempt on the part of Europe to intervene in the affairs of America, they also undertook the reciprocal obligation of never intervening in the affairs of Europe, or—what is more important—in those of the European colonies in America. It is this undertaking which Dr. Kraus classifies as the second great *Unterprinzip* of the original Monroe Doctrine, the logical corollary of the first, and he proceeds to show, in great historical detail, how largely it has been ignored in the diplomatic action of the United States. The first conspicuous instance of its violation was the action of President Taylor in 1849 in sending a secret agent to the Hungarian insurgents, to

* Worthington Ford, loc. cit. p. 394.

arrange for the eventual recognition of the Hungarian Republic and settle the bases of a commercial treaty. It was again infringed by the presence of American representatives at the Conference of Berlin in 1885 and at that of Algeciras in 1906. Of more immediate and practical interest however, from this point of view, are the recent developments of American Imperialism from the time of the Spanish war. The intervention in Cuba, indeed, could be justified under the principles of international law by the right of 'self-preservation,' and the remote possibility of such intervention had been foreseen even in the Monroe Message. To this consideration Dr. Kraus gives due weight, and it is admitted, in this case as in the earlier case of Texas, even by Señor Capella y Pons. None the less, the outcome of the Spanish war blew the second *Unterprinzip* of the Monroe doctrine to the four winds of heaven. Cuba, it is true, was given her independence, though under an American protectorate; but the Philippines, Guam; and Porto Rico were annexed, together with Hawaii—a convenient station on the route to the new Eastern dominions. The United States, from being a purely American, had become a World Power.

The Americas having thus ceased to be 'isolated'—and isolation in any case would be impossible under modern conditions—what was to become of the Monroe Doctrine? Its sole justification in international law—the right of self-preservation—had likewise vanished with the enormous growth in population and power of the United States. But the Monroe Doctrine was too precious a diplomatic asset to be lightly 'scrapped.' Its original *raison d'être* had vanished; its original principles had long since been twisted out of shape; but the name remained a powerful lever for moving public opinion to the support of the Government at Washington in its diplomatic debates with other Powers. Thus there emerged a third *Unterprinzip* of the Monroe Doctrine: the principle that the Americas are the exclusive sphere of influence of the United States, an influence conceived as partly material, partly moral.

As for the material influence, Dr. Kraus shows how, the territorial integrity and the stability of the United States being no longer threatened, the principle of self-preservation was stretched to cover American commercial and industrial

interests. In illustration of this, he quotes a significant passage from the Message of President Grant in 1870, in which the annexation of San Domingo was urgently advocated:

'The acquisition of San Domingo [it runs] is an adherence to the Monroe Doctrine; it is a measure of national protection; it is asserting our just claim to a controlling influence over the great commercial traffic soon to flow east and west by the way of the Isthmus of Darien.' *

It is, however, only during the last ten years that this new interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine has become of vital importance; that is to say, since the 'revolution' in Panama which, in 1903, enabled the United States to obtain the sovereignty of the 'Canal Zone' and so to ensure that the great inter-oceanic waterway should come under their exclusive control. There is no need to enlarge in detail on the effect of this *coup d'état* on the development of Monroism. It is sufficient to say that this has been determined by nervous anxiety to secure the safety of the Canal and of the vast commercial interests created by its construction. To protect these, the Monroe Doctrine was stretched by the Lodge Resolution passed by the United States Senate in 1912, to cover not only attempts by non-American Powers at territorial aggression in the Americas, but all concessions to foreign corporations of bases of military or political value in the neighbourhood of the Canal. This principle, the immediate inspiration of which was due to the report that a Japanese company was negotiating with the Mexican Government for a concession to establish a harbour in Magdalena Bay, has since undergone momentous developments. It was embodied in the draft treaty with Nicaragua presented by Mr. Bryan in the Senate in July 1913. It underlies the official opposition of the Government at Washington to the contracts under negotiation between Lord Murray of Elibank, on behalf of Messrs. Pearson and Son, and the Governments of Colombia and Ecuador, although, as was pointed out in 'The Times' of Sept. 24 last, there is

* Cf. Mr. Roosevelt's speech at the Historical and Geographical Institute of Brazil on October 24 last. 'I feel a special sense of national pride in thinking . . . that we have intervened in San Domingo solely for the good of San Domingo.' L'Étoile du Sud. Rio de Janeiro. November 9.

nothing in the text of these contracts to warrant the suspicion that their aim is anything but purely commercial.*

Whatever justification the principle embodied in the Lodge Resolution may have as an assertion of that right of self-preservation which, as Senator Lodge remarked, is 'older' than the Monroe Doctrine,' it is easy to see how, supported as it is by an apprehensive public opinion in the States, it may be turned into a powerful weapon in the hands of the great North American corporations in their struggle with 'foreigners' for the unexploited wealth of Latin America. We may accept without reserve President Wilson's statement that he objects to the whole policy of 'concessions,' to whomsoever granted, as fundamentally unsound from the point of view of the true interests of the country granting them. It is clear, none the less, that the Monroe Doctrine is being used for all it is worth by those North American interests which, very naturally, want to keep both Americas as their own close preserve. Herein lies, so far as the interests of this country are concerned, the fateful significance of President Wilson's announcement, reported in 'The Times' of Dec. 8, 1913, that as soon as the situation in Mexico is cleared up he will not only press for the ratification by the Senate of Mr. Bryan's treaty with Nicaragua, but that he hopes ultimately to extend this arrangement to cover the whole of Central America, Panama, Cuba, and San Domingo, which would thus fall completely under the effective suzerainty of the United States.† It is not surprising that public opinion in the States is awakening to the

* By the XIII. and XIV. articles of the contract with Ecuador, an abstract of which was published in the Financial Section of 'The Times' on September 6, the contract was to lapse, *ipso facto*, if assigned to any foreign Government or State, and the contractor bound himself, in case of its supposed violation by any other party, not to seek redress through diplomatic channels.

† Under the treaty with Nicaragua the Nicaraguan Government undertakes not to declare war without the consent of the United States; not to make any treaty tending to destroy her independence or giving any non-American Government a *pied à terre* on her soil; not to contract any public debt beyond her obvious resources. The United States assumes the duty of intervening in case of intolerable domestic disorder; receives the right to establish a naval base in Fonseca Bay on the Pacific coast, and is guaranteed the option of constructing any inter-oceanic canal which the Nicaraguan Government may desire to make.

fact that, as 'The Times' correspondent in Washington puts it, 'President Wilson the Democrat is quietly turning a page of 'American history of such importance that the Republicans, 'for all the aggressiveness of their "dollar diplomacy," dared 'to do no more than tentatively lift its corner.' *

It is part of the Puritan tradition, common to this country and to the United States, that the quest of material good should be justified by a moral motive. This characteristic has exposed Great Britain, on the part of foreign critics, to the charge of consistent hypocrisy in her diplomacy, a charge put forward with conviction even when it has been least warranted, as in the case of the abolition of the Slave Trade. The Authoritative Statement, already quoted, deprecates such a charge being brought in connexion with the policy announced by President Wilson, and, so far as the President himself and his immediate advisers are concerned, it would indeed be preposterous to bring it. No one who has studied the President's language during the Mexican crisis can doubt his singleness of purpose or the purity of his motives. But all history proves that it is precisely a lofty idealism in politics which has most often issued in the most material of policies. The 'heavenly philanthropists'—as Dr. Price hailed them—of the French Revolution began by proclaiming the Brotherhood of Man and the dawn of the era of universal peace; in the event, their armed crusade against tyranny developed into a war of frank conquest and the establishment of a tyranny more absolute than those the Revolution had overthrown. The Holy Alliance, in the intention of its founder, was a league for the maintenance of peace and of ordered liberty; it developed into an instrument of soulless reaction enforced by arms. President Wilson proclaims it as a mission of the United States to champion the cause of pure democracy in the Americas, and for this purpose to exercise over the less advanced republics a moral supervision which in the last resort is to be made effective by force. As an assertion of political principle this is revolutionary. But the world will be less concerned with its theoretical basis than with its probable practical effects. The question, in short, is: what guarantee is there that this principle, however disinterested in its original intention,

* See The Times of December 8, p. 10.

may not, if it be once generally admitted, be used to consecrate the most selfish ambitions ?

From the point of view of world politics, the growth of the idea of the moral obligation of the United States under the Monroe Doctrine is one of very singular and very practical interest. This moral obligation, since the formulation of the Wilson Doctrine, is conceived as twofold : (1) that of acting as trustee for the non-American nations in respect of their just claims upon American States ; (2) that of guardian of public order in the Americas and of the democratic institutions upon which this order is assumed to rest. As for the first of these, it had long been recognised at Washington that, since under the Monroe Doctrine the right of non-American Powers to take effective measures to protect their interests in Latin America was denied, the duty of acting for them might in certain cases devolve upon the United States. It was not, however, until 1905, in connexion with the debts of San Domingo, that the principle of the obligation of the United States in this matter was definitely formulated by President Roosevelt in his Message to Congress of the 15th of February. Nothing could have been more proper or more conciliatory than the language which he then used :

'It has for some time been obvious [he said] that those who profit by the Monroe Doctrine must accept certain responsibilities along with the rights which it confers ; and that the same statement applies to those who uphold the Doctrine. It cannot be too often and too emphatically asserted that the United States has not the slightest desire for territorial aggrandisement at the expense of any of its southern neighbours, and will not treat the Monroe Doctrine as an excuse for such aggrandisement on its part.' . . .

We ourselves are simply performing in a peaceful manner . . . part of that international duty which is necessarily involved in the assertion of the Monroe Doctrine. We are bound to show that we perform this duty in good faith and without any intention of . . . conducting ourselves otherwise than so as to benefit both these weaker neighbours and those European Powers which may be brought into contact with them.' *

Thus was established the principle that, under the Monroe Doctrine, the duty of policing the Americas, so far as international financial obligations are concerned, devolved upon

* Text in Kraus, op. cit. p. 451.

the United States. It may be added that the duty, in the case of San Domingo, has been carried out with the most scrupulous exactitude.

It was, however, inevitable that this principle, once admitted, should sooner or later be stretched to cover objects other than those to which it originally applied. The power of a State to pay its debts depends on the stability and efficiency of its institutions; consequently the duty of watching over the solvency of a State naturally leads to that of seeing that its internal conditions are such as to make solvency possible. The function of international trustee assumed by the United States has thus led logically to the assertion, under the Monroe Doctrine, of the duty of intervention for the purpose of preserving or restoring order.* The abstract assertion of this duty by the Government of Washington is, indeed, of long standing, having been formulated by President Polk in his Message to Congress of April 29, 1848, during the war with Mexico, with reference to the Indian rising in Yucatan. But this gloss upon the original Monroe Doctrine has only recently become of vital importance in connexion with the expansion of the influence of the United States over all the Latin-American republics in the neighbourhood of the Panama Canal. It has received a fateful extension in the new doctrine of President Wilson, namely that the duty of intervention on the part of the United States covers not only the restoration of order *de facto*, but also that of order *de jure*. This principle is as far-reaching and as objectionable as any ever advanced by the Holy Alliance. It is indeed not distinguishable from that of the Holy Alliance, save in the underlying idea of what constitutes legitimate government. The European Allies, equally with President Wilson, proclaimed their object to be to 'put a check upon revolutionary initiative,' and the language in which they formulated their policy to this end bears a singular resemblance to that used in the Authoritative Statement already referred to, where it is affirmed that :

'The United States can only regard as the head of any American

* It is not necessary to impute sinister motives. For instance, the recent declaration of the United States Government that it will allow no more revolutions in San Domingo deserves general sympathy.

community a man who enjoys the support, properly expressed and registered, of a majority of his enfranchised fellow-citizens.'

Read in connexion with the two 'points' from President Wilson's policy quoted above, this does not differ in principle from the famous clause of the Troppau Protocol defining the attitude of the Holy Alliance:

'States which have undergone a change of government due to revolution, the results of which threaten other States, *ipso facto* cease to be members of the European Alliance, and remain excluded from it until their situation gives guarantees for legal order and stability. If, owing to such alterations, immediate danger threatens other States, the Powers bind themselves, by peaceful means, or if need be by arms, to bring back the guilty State into the bosom of the Great Alliance.'

The guarantees for legal order and stability were conceived by the sovereigns of the Holy Alliance to lie in the submission of the peoples to their Governments *ab antiquo*; by President Wilson they are assumed to depend on the will of the peoples 'properly expressed and registered.' From the international point of view it matters not which opinion be the more correct; the important thing is not the motive for intervention, but the claim to intervene. It may be asserted in defence of this claim that, to quote Secretary Olney, 'the people of the 'United States have a vital interest in the cause of popular 'self-government,'* and that intervention in defence of this cause is justifiable by the right of self-preservation. Precisely the same justification was urged, in answer to the protests of Great Britain, by the signatories of the Troppau Protocol. The answer of Great Britain was clear, namely that intervention could not be justified on any abstract considerations whatever, but only 'in each case as it arose' by the most urgent motives of self-preservation. It was to assert this principle in the case of the Latin-American colonies that Canning invited the co-operation of the United States; it was to combat the opposite principle, represented by the inner circle of the European Alliance, that the Monroe Doctrine was formulated. Truly it is a singular irony of history that the right of intervention should now be proclaimed from the White House, and the Monroe Doctrine invoked to consecrate the very principle against which at the outset it was directed.

* Instruction of July 20, 1895. In Kraus, p. 441.

The seriousness of the position created for British interests in Latin America by Great Britain's apparently unqualified approval of President Wilson's attitude, may be measured by the excitement aroused in South America by the whole trend of United States policy during the last ten years, an excitement which President Wilson's new policy of intervention, with the unlimited claim to the exercise of at least a moral hegemony which it implies, is not calculated to allay. It will doubtless be pointed out that the new 'Wilson Doctrine' has by no means been received with universal disfavour in South America; that indeed it has been welcomed in certain quarters, and precisely in those which the Government of the United States desires to encourage. To some Latin-American theoretical democrats the utterances of President Wilson have appealed as the proclamation of a new and powerful crusade against the régime of dictatorships, oligarchies, and *caudillismo* generally under which they groan. The idea, which has been agitated lately, of a confederation of the Latin-American Great Powers—Argentina, Brazil, and Chile—against the aggressions of the United States,* is, says the London correspondent of the 'Diario de la Plata' of Montevideo, inconceivable; and to true democrats, engaged in the struggle with plutocracy and oligarchy, its realisation would be wholly objectionable. For a confederation of three countries governed by oligarchies, with peoples for the greater part politically enslaved, would convert itself into a Holy Alliance against these peoples, and the longed-for reign of liberty, now approaching, would be rendered more remote than ever. In certain quarters, then, the new Monroism is hailed as 'the holy apostolate of the 'peoples.' †

In Latin America, however, the voice of pure democracy, though loud and persistent, is hardly representative; for it is not too much to say that in these countries democratic principles are not understood or appreciated even by the majority of those who are most eager in proclaiming them. The political master-passion of the Latin-American peoples

---

* Anti-Yanqui clubs, such as the A B C (i.e. Argentina, Brazil, Chile), at Rio de Janeiro, are widespread; but their present importance need not be exaggerated.

† Diario de la Plata, Nov. 19, 1913.

is not the love of personal liberty, but patriotic pride; and they would rather suffer any wrongs at the hands of their compatriots than have these wrongs redressed by the intervention of foreigners. This has been made clear by the attitude of the 'Constitutionalists' in Mexico. They welcome the moral and material support of the United States; but should President Wilson decide on armed intervention, they declare that they would make common cause against the invader. If, then, the principle of intervention be thus regarded by those who might have been supposed to be most ready to welcome it, we may gauge the effect of its untimely proclamation in those countries where it is interpreted solely as a threat of future domination. This interpretation may be considered offensive, in view of President Wilson's repudiation of the imperialist policy of his predecessors, but it can hardly be condemned as wholly unreasonable. Every new phase in the development of the Monroe Doctrine has been accompanied by similar disclaimers, on the part of the United States Government, of any ambition for territorial aggrandisement at the expense of its neighbours, all doubtless made in perfect good faith. But Latin-American patriotism is less concerned with good intentions than with the direction of the path they serve to pave. What the direction of this path has been so far cannot be better described than in the words of Professor Hiram Bingham:

> 'In 1895 [he says] we declare that we are practically sovereign on the continent; in 1898 we take a rich American island from a European Power, and in 1903 we go through the form of preventing a South American republic from subduing a revolution in one of her distant provinces, and eventually take a strip of that province because we believe we owe it to the world to build the Panama Canal.' *

It is this last piece of what they regard as cynical aggression that the Latin-Americans cannot forget; they comment on the refusal of Washington, so loud in its advocacy of the abstract principles of arbitration, to submit the questions arising out of this aggression to the judgment of The Hague Tribunal; they note that the 'Wilson Doctrine' is in fact being

* 'The Monroe Doctrine an exploded Shibboleth.' Atlantic Monthly, June 1913, p. 724.

used to consecrate the principle of a Yanqui protectorate over the Central American States. The completion of the Panama Canal itself, which should do so much for the material development of Latin America, has become a menace.

'Will the destruction of the last barrier (the Gamboa dike), [asks the Colombian journalist and sociologist Señor Vasques Jepes] be the beginning of the definitive preponderance of North over South America? . . . The opening of the Panama Canal will mark a date which our grandchildren will remember—perhaps with sorrow—when they shall see each of the States of Latin America represented by a little twinkle on the Stars and Stripes.' *

In short, President Wilson, to apply to him a phrase used of another idealist in power—the august originator of the Holy Alliance—is widely suspected by Latin-Americans of 'disguising 'under the language of evangelical abnegation schemes of far-'reaching ambition.'

The strength of this suspicion was well illustrated by a recent debate in the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies arising out of an article in the 'Jornal do Commercio,' the most influential newspaper in Rio de Janeiro, which had been interpreted as approving the support stated by it to have been given by the Government to President Wilson's policy. In reply to an interpellation by Senhor Moacyr, it was denied on behalf of the Government that any such support had been given. Senhor Moacyr replied in a speech in which he denounced the new Monroism in vigorous terms:

'The ambassador of the United States in London, Mr. Page, lately repeated the declarations of President Wilson in a public speech † by which English opinion was strongly moved, and in which he said that the United States would not tolerate any foreign financial or industrial control in Latin America.

That is to say, that the republics of Latin America are no longer to have the right to grant concessions and privileges at their convenience to foreigners, and that, under pretext of emancipating these republics and of guarding them from a highly fanciful peril of European imperialism, the United States submit them purely and simply to its own control. What becomes, in this case, of the integrity and sovereignty of Latin America for which the great Republic exhibits so much solicitude? More and

* Quoted in L'Étoile du Sud (Rio de Janeiro) for Nov. 9, 1913.
† At the annual dinner of the Savage Club, on Dec. 6, 1913.

more the Monroe Doctrine, new style, betrays this manifest tendency: "America for the United States."

The English, who were seeking for petroleum concessions from Colombia and Ecuador, seem inclined to yield to the opposition of the United States in the name of this Monroe Doctrine, which is no longer a formula of emancipation but one of enslavement. Will the great Latin-American republics submit to this American control and subordinate their foreign policy and their economic orientation to the interests of Washington? We do not believe it.' *

Significance is added to this utterance, and to many others of the same character, by the fact that it closely followed on Mr. Roosevelt's efforts, during his visit to Rio de Janeiro, to conciliate Brazilian opinion. Mr. Roosevelt, during his tour in South America, has been the spokesman of yet another conception of the Monroe Doctrine,† which would make the United States the centre of a sort of Holy Alliance of the greater American republics. In his lecture before the Historical Institute in Rio on the 24th of October, he put forward this view of an eventual partnership of the United States, Brazil, and the other great republics in policing South America. It cannot be said that the proposal has been greeted with enthusiasm. The Brazilian Press seems to have been less impressed with the magnificence of the prospect thus opened up for the Latin-American countries than with the 'Yankee utilitarianism' which led an ex-President of the United States to demand a fee of £400 for the lecture in which he proclaimed the gospel of 'American Internationalism.' The caustic comment of the eminent Brazilian scholar, Senhor Oliveira Lima, on these criticisms is perhaps even more significant of the trend of feeling. After pointing out that the Brazilians had spent some £12,000 in paying illustrious European lecturers to cover them with flowers of rhetoric, he asks why they should reserve their censures for Mr. Roosevelt,

'who, for £400, has sung the beauties of American internationalism, and has gratified our vanity by promising eventually to entrust us with the big stick, by speaking in vague terms of all that the United States has to fear from us, and by flattering our statesmen.'

---

* 'Le Brésil' for December 14, 1913.

† 'This doctrine should become continental, and cease to be unilateral.' The lecture is reported in 'L'Étoile du Sud,' November 9, 1913.

It would seem that, whatever function Great Britain may assume, Brazil at least is not inclined—in Senhor Moacyr's phrase—to act as train-bearer (*caudatario*) to the United States.

President Polk, when the European Powers, in connexion with the Oregon and Texas disputes, showed signs of uneasiness at the expansive claims of the United States, declared with republican complacency that :

> ' Jealousy among the different European sovereigns of Europe, lest any one of them might become too powerful for the rest, has caused them anxiously to desire the establishment of what they term the " balance of power." It cannot be permitted to have any application on the North American continent, and especially to the United States.' *

In assuming that the idea of a ' balance of power ' can obtain only among jealous autocracies this utterance is naïve ; as a statement of policy it is unexceptionable. The United States were and are no more under any obligation to show any respect for the balance of power than were Louis XIV., or revolutionary France, or the great Napoleon, or Great Britain in respect of the dominion of the seas. The theory of the balance of power is not a rule of international law ; no ethical motive underlies its acceptance ; it is at most but a name given to a traditional counsel of expediency which, whenever one of a group of States threatens to become too powerful for the security of the rest, leads these almost instinctively to combine against it. The Latin-American republics, seeing the balance of power in the Americas overset by the vast and growing weight of the United States, may possibly form such a combination.† There are even signs that they may attempt to recall the Old World into existence to redress the balance of the New ; and in making this attempt they will be able to argue with truth that the Power which dominates the Americas will dominate the world. But, even supposing this last were an exaggeration, the vastness of British Imperial and financial interests in the Americas

* Message of Dec. 2, 1845. In Kraus, op. cit. p. 407.

† ' El Tiempo ' of Guayaquil, for Nov. 23, 1913, after denouncing President Wilson's Mexican policy as ' a fresh advertisement of the peril that threatens the Spanish republics,' adds that ' the combined force of the weak when menaced has not been sterile and in the end ambition has always had its Leipzig.'

makes the maintenance in the Western Hemisphere of a just equilibrium little less important than in the Eastern. It is not, then, to our interest to see this balance utterly overthrown by any Power, however friendly.

Still less is it to our interest to seem to assist the process by a too-evident anxiety to purchase American good-will at almost any cost. It is argued that this attitude is justified by the fact that it is of incomparably more importance to keep on good terms with an 'Anglo-Saxon' nation, numbering 100,000,000 people, than to cultivate the friendship of the Latin-American republics, which are of little weight in the world since they are still poor, ill-organised, and disunited. This is to take short views. Latin America, it is true, is still undeveloped; but its development is proceeding with astounding rapidity, and its more progressive regions promise to take in the economy of the twentieth century a place comparable with that of the United States in the nineteenth. It is not good policy, either in respect of our present or our future interests, to imperil any wholesome influence we may have in these countries, an influence largely due to their belief that Great Britain respects their liberties, and that, in case of urgent need, they could rely at least upon her moral support in maintaining them. Nor, were Great Britain to make it clear that such indeed is her attitude, would this in the long run affect our relations of friendship with the American people, whatever temporary agitation it might provoke. The new Wilson Doctrine has by no means been greeted with universal approval in the United States; and, whatever appeal it may at present make to democratic sentiment, the abstract principle of intervention is likely to lose its popularity in proportion as its practical consequences are realised, for the American people will not be eager to repeat indefinitely their experiences in Cuba and in the Philippines. It is probably true, as the Authoritative Statement points out, that any threat of active foreign opposition would rally the whole nation round President Wilson. It is not here suggested that any such threat should be used. The *gravamen* of the charge against our Government is, not that they have refrained from formally protesting against this new doctrine of intervention, but that by their language they have seemed to endorse it. It would have been easy for Mr. Asquith to have conciliated South American

opinion, without doing anything to wound North American susceptibilities, by simply stating the intention of His Majesty's Government to maintain, really and not only professedly, the traditional British policy.

What is this traditional policy? Its earliest formal definition is contained in a memorandum drawn up by Lord Castlereagh in 1818, in answer to the Emperor Alexander's proposal to make the Holy Alliance effective for the guarantee of all 'legitimate rights,' and it is singularly applicable to the latest developments of the new Monroism.

'It cannot be maintained for a moment [he wrote] that States have a right to intervene in the internal affairs of others to prevent change, whether "illegal" or "legal," for how can foreign States be left safely to judge of what is "legal" in another State? . . . The only safe principle is that of the Law of Nations—that no State has the right to interfere with its neighbours by its internal proceedings, and that, if it does, provided they use a sound discretion, their right of interference is clear.' *

On this principle the Government, recognising the peculiar interest of the United States in the question of the restoration of order in Mexico, may be right in leaving President Wilson a free hand; but they should have made it clear that, in doing so, they do not necessarily endorse the abstract and far-reaching doctrine on which he chooses to base his policy. In 1821 Great Britain similarly allowed a free hand to Austria for the purpose of 'restoring order' in Naples, because she recognised that a successful military revolt in southern Italy imperilled the interests of the Habsburg Monarchy in the north; but, in doing so, she vigorously repudiated the principle of intervention consecrated by the Troppau Protocol, by which it was sought to give a 'moral' basis to this action. The analogy is perfect; and since appeal is to tradition—which is history—it may be added that the same Government which allowed the intervention of Austria in Naples protested with vigour against the intervention of France in Spain two years later. Each such case must, in fact—as Castlereagh put it—be judged as it arises, on its merits. Great Britain is not concerned with the principles which guide the policy of foreign

* Mem. of Lord Castlereagh. F.O. Records. Continent. Aix. Sept.–Dec. 1818. Enclosed in Castlereagh to Liverpool. No. 13.

States, but with their application. It is inconceivable that the United States will ever attempt to enforce this claim to watch over the purity of Presidential elections in Latin America; imagination boggles at the thought. But, since the claim has been made, it is important that it should be clearly understood that it is based upon a principle which Great Britain never has admitted and never can admit, since it is destructive of all just ideas of national independence. If she follow her traditional policy, she will, after making her general attitude towards the principle of intervention perfectly clear, wait till each case of its proposed practical application arises, and then act as her own honour and interests dictate.

WALTER ALISON PHILLIPS.

THE COMING LAND TYRANNY

1. **Report of the Land Enquiry Committee.** Vol. I. Hodder and Stoughton. 1913.
2. **A Pilgrimage of British Farming.** By A. D. HALL. Murray. 1913.
3. **The Occupying Ownership of Land.** By BEVIL TOLLEMACHE. Murray. 1913.
4. **Rural Denmark and its Lessons.** By Sir RIDER HAGGARD. New edition. Longmans, Green. 1913.
5. **Rural England.** By Sir RIDER HAGGARD. Longmans, Green. 1902.

IN the July issue of this Review an examination was made of the results of the land taxes imposed upon the country by the Budget of 1909, and it was shown that these taxes had completely failed in the primary purpose for which they were intended. That primary purpose, according to the declarations of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Prime Minister, was the raising of revenue to meet the cost of Dreadnoughts and Old Age Pensions. Instead of yielding any revenue at all, these taxes after four years' working have involved the country in a net loss of at least £1,133,000. It was further shown in the article referred to that it is impossible to set off against this loss the land valuation which accounts for the larger part of the expense incurred; for that valuation is useless for any purpose except the assessment of these taxes.

In this failure is to be found the true origin of the new land campaign upon which Mr. Lloyd George has started off hot-foot, followed at a little distance and with some apparent reluctance by his colleagues in the Cabinet. When a politician has made a colossal blunder the only way of escaping from the discredit he deserves is to start a new hare; for in the excitement of the fresh chase the public will forget the old folly. So short, indeed, is the public memory that it is even possible to promise over again exactly the same boons that were promised before. In the course of the Budget campaign of 1909 the country was promised that when the new land taxes came into operation the power of the 'dukes' would

be broken, that local authorities would be able to obtain land at reasonable prices for public improvements, that an impetus would be given to the building of houses for the people and to the extension of garden cities, and generally that the land of the country would be more actively developed to the encouragement of industry and the destruction of unemployment.* All these things are promised again to-day, with the same sublime assurance as before ; the sole difference is that whereas previously these boons were to be secured by the stimulus of taxation, now they are to be obtained by direct compulsion.

From the point of view of the party politician this difference is slight, for in both cases the persons attacked are a small minority of the community and the persons to whom benefits are promised are a large majority. Therefore, so far as the winning of votes is concerned, it matters nothing whether the screw is put upon the landowners by a new system of taxes or by a body of Land Commissioners armed with plenary powers to redistribute private property. The change of method does, however, point to a very considerable change of outlook in the Liberal Party. The land taxes of 1909 were founded on the individualist conception of society ; the new scheme is essentially socialistic. Henry George, the apostle of the single tax, believed that if land were sufficiently taxed the bonds which shackle human energy would be burst, and that then individual enterprise, rejoicing in a new freedom, would alone suffice to make farms fertile and cities beautiful and to banish from the world crime and sorrow and disease. All this is set out with rhetorical profusion in ' Progress and Poverty ' and is still accepted with implicit faith by the single-taxers. For a moment they captured Mr. Lloyd George, and hence the Budget of 1909. He has now completely thrown them over, and their resulting anger

---

* ' Nothing will extend garden cities more than this Budget. It will have a great effect, not merely in developing land for building, but in doing so on rational lines.'—Mr. Lloyd George, Oct. 22, 1909.

' The greatest provision of all for unemployment, in my judgment, is contained in the Land Clauses of the Budget.'—Mr. Lloyd George, Nov. 20, 1909.

' I believe, and I am not alone in that opinion, that the Land Taxes will have the effect of developing land—of opening up land.' —Mr. Lloyd George, Nov. 4, 1909.

forms one of the interesting side issues in the coming political campaign. Convinced of the futility of taxing land upon its supposed prairie value, Mr. Lloyd George now aims at the direct application of the coercive power of the State. He has ceased to be an individualist land taxer, and has become a socialist land tyrant.

That the word tyranny is not too strong to use in this connexion will be seen from a mere enumeration of the powers which are to be entrusted to the new Land Commissioners. They were set out by Mr. Asquith in his speech at the National Liberal Club on the 9th of December last.

In the first place the Land Commissioners are to have power to fix a minimum wage for every agricultural labourer in England—but not apparently in Ireland, though wages in Ireland are very much lower than in England. This minimum wage is thus defined by the Prime Minister: 'I mean a wage such as to ensure a labourer of average 'industry and prudence reasonable conditions of living, 'among which I include the ability to pay a commercial or 'economic rent for the house in which he lives.'

Mr. Lloyd George in a subsequent speech at Pwllheli (Dec. 22. 13) amplified this statement by explaining that the minimum wage would not apply to 'old men, who cannot be 'expected to render the same service as in the days of their 'prime.' Therefore, as regards the labourers the Commissioners are to have the power of deciding whether a man must receive the full wage (or none at all) because he is still in his prime, or whether he can be permitted to accept a lower wage because his powers are declining or because he is not of 'average 'industry.' Whatever the arguments may be for this proposal, it certainly involves a very grave extension of the power of the State over private individuals. The same Commissioners are also to decide for each district of England what it costs a man to live, and presumably to bring up a family. Their views may differ very greatly from the views of the men affected, but their opinion is to have the force of law. Hardly less serious is the interference with the liberty of the farmer. He may be paying, as some farmers undoubtedly do, an unjustly low wage to men who are highly skilled and efficient; or he may be, out of kindliness of heart, or because good men are scarce, employing several inefficient men to do work which

he could get done more cheaply by paying a higher wage to one good man. In the former case, no minimum wage that is likely to be fixed will do justice to the underpaid skilled man ; in the latter case, the farmer may be compelled by the arbitrary action of the State to dismiss men who have spent their lives in his service, and perhaps also to alter his system of cultivation in order to reduce his labour bill.

With the idea of making good the hardship to the farmer, the Land Commissioners are further to have power to interfere between landlord and tenant and to readjust rents on the basis of the alterations made in wages. Here again the liberty of both parties is placed at the mercy of the Commission. Mr. Asquith declares that this body will be judicial, but, unlike every other judicial body, it will have neither to interpret definite laws nor to ascertain precise facts. Instead it will be called upon to decide whether a commercial bargain made between two freely contracting parties is or is not ' fair.' Nor is the power of the Commissioners limited to cases where a farmer raises his men's wages. Wherever a farmer can allege that agricultural conditions have changed adversely, he may go to the Commissioners and ask them to grant him a reduction of rent, whatever bargain he may have previously made with his landlord. In the case of small farmers and holders it is not even to be necessary to allege that agricultural conditions are adverse. These smaller men may at any time plead ' land hunger ' and apply to the Commissioners to revise their rents, and the Commissioners will have power to ' determine what is fair between landlord and ' tenant.' No principle is laid down to guide the Commissioners in these decisions. In fixing the farmer's rent they are not instructed to ask whether, as in the case of the labourer's wage, the farmer can make a reasonable living ; the only indication given as to the course they should follow is conveyed in Mr. Asquith's incidental remark that English farmers are not as a whole over-rented, but are ' paying less than the ' economic rate which would be paid if their holdings were put ' up to be bid for in the open market.' It seems to follow that Mr. Asquith expects the Land Commissioners to guide themselves by the competition of the market ; but if that be the case it is not easy to see why their authority should be invoked to fix rents which the market can fix for itself. Yet

from the judgment of these Commissioners there is to be no appeal. They are to have the power to cancel any bargain between farmer and landowner, however recently made, and to prescribe a new status for the two parties upon their own view of circumstances with which from necessity they can only be imperfectly acquainted.

In this connexion it is worth while to notice how the Scottish Land Court set up by the present Government does its work. The following account is taken from the 'Scotsman' of Dec. 19, 1913:

> 'The Court is split up into two or more groups, each of which goes off on its own by train or motor car, accompanied by a clerk. They often inspect a large number of holdings in a day, time not permitting of much more than a casual glance at the different fields and the buildings and fences. The inspections must take place at any time of the year under all conditions of weather, and yet it is on such inspections that fair or equitable rents are being fixed, generally for a period of seven years.'

In addition to fixing rents by methods which must by the necessities of the case be very similar to those of the Scottish Land Court, the English Land Commissioners are to have the power of fixing the price of land wherever it is wanted, or alleged to be wanted, for small holdings. They are to have a similar power in towns wherever land is wanted for public improvements, and even when a municipality thinks that it would like to speculate in land, or, in Mr. Asquith's euphemistic phrase, to 'obtain land in advance of immediate requirements."

Other powers to be conferred on the Commissioners as regards urban land are equally far-reaching, both as regards the principles involved and the probable effect upon the community. The Land Commissioners are to have power to revise all urban leases, and all future tenancies of business premises, even though the tenancy may only be for a few years. In the case of existing leases the Commissioners must take account of existing rights, but they are to be empowered to say that a lease due to terminate at a certain date must be extended, subject to the payment to the owner of such compensation for his reversionary interest as they decide to be equitable. This alone is a very serious interference with the freedom of the individual. An owner

may have deliberately fixed the period of the lease for important reasons of his own, and may have conceded advantageous terms to the tenant because of his accepting that period. It is a wide extension of the coercive power of the State to give to any tribunal power to cancel a bargain solely for the convenience of one of the parties.

Even more serious is the general power proposed to be given to the Commissioners to revise all future agreements for the letting of business premises. In his speech at the National Liberal Club, Mr. Asquith expressly limited this power to the case of leases for more than twenty-one years; but subsequently he was approached by a body calling itself the Town Tenants' League, which pointed out that the great majority of traders have tenancies for less than twenty-one years, and often for only three or five years. In reply the Prime Minister—to whose squeezability there is apparently no limit—caused a letter to be written dated Dec. 20th, in which he explained that he had been compelled to deal with the subject at the National Liberal Club in a more or less general manner, but that it was the intention of the Government

'to give to tenants of business premises, though their leases or tenancies may be for less than twenty-one years, the right to submit their case for an extension to the Land Commissioners. The Land Commissioners should have power to grant such an extension, or in the alternative to give such compensation as the equities of the case require.'

Thus apparently if a man makes an agreement to take a shop for three years he can subsequently go to the Commissioners and claim to have an extension, or in the alternative 'compensation.' What he is to be compensated for is not clear to Englishmen who have been brought up to believe that a bargain freely made should be honourably observed. When a man hires a house on a lease or agreement he undertakes to restore the house to the owner at the end of the agreed period. His rights over it then terminate absolutely, and however much he may for any reason desire to remain in possession no compensation can be due to him if he is merely required to carry out his bargain.

It may be argued that since he made his bargain circumstances have changed; that he has created a profitable business connexion which he would lose by leaving the premises. But

suppose events went the other way: suppose his business failed and that the neighbourhood declined: is the landlord to have power to go to the Commission and demand that the tenant shall renew the lease? Why should it be assumed that the bargain is only to be revised when the tenant will gain by revision and never to be revised for the landlord's benefit? It is easy for Mr. Asquith to say that the Commissioners will act judicially and that they will deal equitably between parties, but the effect of his proposals is to give power to one of the two parties to a bargain to drag the other into Court, not to get the bargain enforced, but to get it broken.

That, in a nutshell, expresses the fundamental proposition involved in the new land scheme of the Government. Hitherto the business of our Courts of law has been to enforce contracts; now a new Court is to be set up to break contracts. 'To hell with contracts,' says Mr. Larkin; Mr. Asquith, with greater decorum of language, proposes to send contracts to the Land Commission. The effect on the liberties of the nation is much the same. Mr. Larkin's substitute for the observance of contracts is the tyranny of any gang of men who choose to get together and call themselves a trade union. If they can command sufficient physical force they are to be allowed to prevent their fellow citizens from working and even from eating. Mr. Asquith's Land Commission will act with less violence but more persistence. Mr. Larkin after a brief struggle is crushed by the common sense of the community and disappears; but Mr. Asquith's Land Commission will always be there, backed by the whole power of the State, and regulating by arbitrary decree all that part of the life of the nation which is concerned either with the tilling of the soil or with the hiring of houses. In no exaggerated phrase, but in sober English, this means a land tyranny.

The next step is to ask what pleas are put forward to justify the creation of this coming tyranny. Mr. Asquith is a lawyer trained in the old school of English Liberalism, and even now presumably prepared to accept in theory the proposition that the State should only interfere with private contracts if it is necessary to do so for the public good. What then are his pleas on behalf of a proposal which in effect wipes out private contract so far as dealings with land are concerned? His

general reasons were given in the opening of his speech at the National Liberal Club in the following words :

'There are certain facts so much beyond dispute that they may almost be taken as common ground. Such are the steady decline in the number of our rural population, the inadequate development in some, and these important, respects of the full resources of the soil, and the congestion of population, often under unwholesome conditions of habitation, in our great urban centres.'

One would imagine from the way in which these propositions are stated that Mr. Asquith believes that they are peculiar to Great Britain. They are, as he of course very well knows, universal. In all parts of the world, with the possible exception of Denmark, rural populations are declining relatively or absolutely, and urban populations are growing. In France neither small holdings nor protective tariffs prevent the steady decline in the population of some of the richest agricultural departments, while the large towns still continue to grow more crowded. In Germany the purely rural population has virtually ceased to grow and the huge annual increase in the population of the Empire has to be stowed away in tenement blocks in towns. In the United States, with millions of acres of land still untouched, the population of the towns is every census gaining more and more rapidly upon the population of the rural districts. As regards Australia, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom may be referred to a recent speech by the Premier of New South Wales. Speaking at Sydney on December 19 last, Mr. Holman said that :

'one of the principal aims of the Government of New South Wales would be to make life more tolerable and attractive for the people in the country districts. . . . By their policy the Government hoped to stem the steady immigration from the country into the city which was one of the most alarming features of to-day.' *

That is almost a paraphrase of Mr. Asquith's own language with regard to England. Yet in New South Wales the State has had from the outset full control over all the land of the colony and still controls the greater part of it ; there is no survival of feudalism ; there is no House of Lords, there is not even a single duke ; and a Labour Party is in power. It is permissible to ask why a man of Mr. Asquith's calibre,

* The Times, Dec. 20, 1913.

knowing the facts as he must know them, should thus throw dust in the eyes of the public.

The question of the inadequate development of the resources of our soil is less easily brought to the test of precise facts. Opinions differ greatly as to the practical results of our agricultural system. Ten years ago English agriculture was undoubtedly in a bad way, and by those who knew the facts grave anxiety was expressed with regard to the future unless the nation promptly devoted more attention to the needs of agriculture. It is sufficient here to refer the reader to the interesting and painstaking survey of English agriculture undertaken by Mr. (now Sir) Rider Haggard in the years 1901 and 1902, and published under the title of 'Rural England' at the end of the latter year. The author of these volumes appealed to both parties to devise measures for dealing with the decay of the rural population and for securing a fuller utilisation of the resources of our soil. But the politicians in 1902 were busy with other problems and they left the land question alone. Perhaps it is as well that they did, for many of the evils which then so oppressed thoughtful observers have since been mitigated to a very considerable extent, mainly by the operation of economic laws. It is striking to contrast the general note of Mr. A. D. Hall's 'Pilgrimage of British Farming,' published in August 1913, with that of Sir Rider Haggard's 'Rural England' published eleven years earlier. Here are a few passages from Mr. Hall's general conclusions which may be commended to impatient politicians, or rather to politicians who grow impatient when they get hold of a cry which they think has electoral value, but who will shut their eyes to any evil so long as no votes are to be won by clamouring for its redress:

'Among farmers themselves there is no land question, no smouldering feeling nor general current of opinion that calls for a "policy"; in the main they would rather ask to be let alone. . . . In the first place we must recognise that the industry is at present sound and prosperous. The great depression touched its nadir about 1894; since that time prices have been moving upwards and methods improving. . . . Of course every farmer has not been making money; bad business habits and slipshod management are far too common, and nothing is more surprising than the way bad farming exists alongside good. We suppose that among grocers or gunmakers, solicitors or saddlers, the same inequality of

performance exists though the results are not set out so openly; but still other businesses can be standardised in a way that is not possible to agriculture. But to a man who takes the trouble to learn and who attends to his business, farming now offers every prospect of a good return on his capital. . . . As to land tenure, we need to recognise that the characteristic British system to which our farming owes the pre-eminence it still enjoys, is one of tenancy of comparatively large farms, a system which, whatever may be its defects, draws men of capital to agriculture and leaves them with their capital free to put into their business. It is not a logical system, it admits of injustice, it often condones bad farming, but, our people being what they are, it works; and judged by results it has got more out of the land and produced better crops and stock than any other existing system.'

This report by a trained observer, whose competence the Government have recognised by appointing him to discharge responsible duties on the Development Commission, cannot be lightly ignored. It is confirmed by all the evidence available. On all sides one hears of a new life in the industry of agriculture. Farmers are abandoning their old traditional methods wherever these yield poor results, and are boldly experimenting with new devices based upon scientific research. New seeds are being tried, new crops are being produced, new men have invaded the farming industry. In every direction there is enterprise and hope. Even the decline in the agricultural population, which had been continuous for several decades down to 1901, was, according to the census figures, checked during the decade ending 1911. During that decade the number of male persons engaged in agriculture in England and Wales increased from 924,000 to 972,000.* Yet the politicians, waking up a decade too late, make speeches about the decline of agriculture.

One of the points on which Mr. Asquith and his 'advance' scout,' the Chancellor of the Exchequer, have laid great stress is the lack of security for the farmer's capital. It really seems as if politicians never trouble to read the Reports of the Committees they themselves have appointed or even to remember the Bills they themselves have passed. In 1908 the Liberal Government, with a characteristic flourish of trumpets, passed an Agricultural Holdings Act, which they proclaimed would give full security to the farmer. Yet at the National Liberal Club the Prime Minister stated that:

* See letter from Mr. Chiozza Money, M.P., in The Times of Dec. 29, 1913.

'The real grievance of the farmer under the existing system is that notwithstanding the succession of Agricultural Holdings Acts he in many cases lacks adequate security for doing the best, for making the best, out of the land.'

Either Mr. Asquith has forgotten what he and his party said about the peculiar merits of their own Act of 1908, or he is prepared to admit that the work of Liberal legislators will not stand the test of even five years' experience. His statement, though couched in general terms, is apparently intended to refer to a proposal made by the Welsh Land Commission that, in addition to the existing claims for compensation, a tenant should be entitled to claim for certain other items which the Commission specified. This proposal, *inter alia*, was considered by a Committee appointed by Lord Carrington in March 1911, and since known, from the name of its chairman, as the Haversham Committee. Lord Haversham is a Liberal peer, and the Committee included three Liberal members of Parliament, one Labour member, and one Liberal ex-member. The Conservative members of the Committee were in a clear minority. The Committee reported in January 1912. One of the opening paragraphs of their Report furnishes a complete answer to most of the attacks which Mr. Lloyd George has levelled against the large landowners of England:

'Witnesses before the Committee were practically unanimous in expressing the view that the tenants farming on the large estates of England and Wales desired nothing better than to remain as tenants under their present landlords, and, in view of the remission of rent by landlords in bad seasons, and the execution of repairs and improvements over and above the strictly agricultural requirements of the farms, the position of tenants under good landlords is apparently a satisfactory one.'

On the specific question of the proposed amendments of the Agricultural Holdings Act, the Committee expressed their agreement with the Welsh Land Commission so far as Wales might be concerned, but as regards England they reported emphatically that they could not recommend the proposed amendments as they 'are convinced that at present the 'tenant is safeguarded under Act of Parliament, custom and 'agreement for his expenditure, so far as is possible.' A separate Report on this point was added by Mr. Colin Campbell, the chairman of the National Farmers' Union, who admitted

that many farmers might be disappointed at the verdict of the Committee, and explained in detail why he personally supported that verdict. It is somewhat curious that the Prime Minister should entirely ignore so emphatic a Report by a Committee appointed by his own colleague, Lord Carrington.

The main purpose, it must be added, of the Haversham Committee was to deal with the case of farmers who might be compelled to abandon their farms on the occasion of any change in the ownership of their holdings. This problem is a new one and constitutes what a cynic might call one of the humours of the Liberal campaign against landowners. Largely as the result of the Budget of 1909, and of the rabid attacks upon the whole landowning class which accompanied the discussion of that Budget, many landowners have been selling their estates. They have grown tired of being held up to public obloquy and at the same time marked down for penal taxation; and seeing prices for land on the up-grade they have taken advantage of the opportunity to clear out before their pockets are further picked and their characters further besmirched. In many cases they have given special facilities to their tenants to buy their farms, but the tenants have often been unable to raise the requisite capital. Hardships may have resulted in a few cases because, for the purposes of the sale, it was necessary to give the tenants notice to quit. At once Mr. Lloyd George seizes upon this grievance as a platform point for his new campaign, though it is the direct result of his own attack upon landlords. The Report of the Haversham Committee on this point was that the evil was less extensive than had been represented, but they recommended that the tenant should be entitled to a longer notice to quit; and some of the members of the Committee further recommended that the State should in such cases assist the tenant to buy his holding by lending him not more than four-fifths of the purchase-money at the lowest rate of interest that will secure the State against loss. Other members of the Committee made the more socialistic proposal that the State should itself buy farms to let to tenants.

But the proposal which has proved politically the most interesting was made on the single responsibility of one member of the Committee, Mr. Trustram Eve, secretary to the Farmers' Club. Mr. Eve proposed that the whole of the purchase price

should be advanced by the State, as in the case of the Irish Land Purchase Acts, and should be paid off in a term of years. This proposal has been endorsed by the leader of the Unionist Party in the House of Lords. Lord Lansdowne has indeed gone far beyond Mr. Trustram Eve, for while Mr. Eve apparently intended to confine his proposals to cases where the tenant was in risk of being dispossessed by the sale of his farm over his head, Lord Lansdowne proposes that 'wherever the landlord 'might be found willing to sell land and the tenant willing to 'buy it' the State should advance the whole of the purchase-money.* This Unionist land scheme, as it has been called, was dealt with by Lord Eversley in a letter to 'The Times' (Sept. 23rd, 1913). There is only space here to summarise the salient points of this masterly exposure of the unsoundness of Lord Lansdowne's scheme. In the first place, the analogy of the Irish Land Purchase Acts breaks down the moment it is examined, because in Ireland the farmer possessed a valuable tenant-right generally worth as much as the freehold, and often more. Therefore the State in advancing the whole of the purchase price was in effect advancing only half the value of the property. In England there is no corresponding tenant-right, so that if the State advanced the whole purchase-money a very slight depreciation in the value of land would leave the loan uncovered. Again, in Ireland the judicial rents furnished a convenient basis on which to settle terms of purchase; there is no such basis in England, nor is it possible to see how any government valuer could fix the value of a farm for sale except upon the basis of the offers made for it. But if the tenant knows that he can have the full purchase-money from the State on extremely easy terms he will certainly be tempted to bid higher than if he had to go to his banker for the bulk of the capital and hunt round among his friends for the balance. Consequently the immediate effect of Lord Lansdowne's scheme would be to put up the price of all land, and thus enable landowners to unload upon their tenants on favourable terms at the risk of the State.

As an illustration of the futility of such schemes of State-aided purchase when looked at from the public point of view,

* Lord Lansdowne emphasised this point in a letter to Col. Sprot, published in the Daily Telegraph, Dec. 19, 1913.

Lord Eversley quotes the case of the sale by the Duke of Bedford of his Devonshire property. With the object of multiplying the number of yeomen farmers, the Duke gave to his tenants the opportunity of purchasing their farms on very easy terms, leaving two-thirds of the money on mortgage. 'It resulted that in five years all the tenant purchasers of the 'Devonshire property re-sold their farms at a profit to persons 'who re-let them to tenants at rents far above those paid to the 'Duke.' In the same way, on the Huntingdonshire property of the same Duke, 'a large proportion of the tenant purchasers 'resold their farms at a profit of £500 to £2000 and retired 'from business.' If a private landlord likes thus to endow his old tenants at his own expense he is perfectly entitled to do so, but there is absolutely no reason why the credit of the State, which is the common property of all of us, should be used for such a purpose. The credit of the State is not unlimited. Already the loans for Irish land purchase have helped very greatly to depreciate the price of Consols, as any stockbroker will testify. But Ireland is a little country compared with England, and if land purchase with State credit is to be adopted here as well as there the burden of raising the money may easily send Consols down another ten or even twenty points. That is not a risk lightly to be incurred. Moreover, if once the principle be admitted that private individuals may sponge upon the State for capital, whenever they can find a political party to support their claims, there is no end to the demands that may be put forward. Shopkeepers may demand capital to enable them to buy freehold premises; doctors to buy practices; lawyers to pay for their training. Why should the farmer alone be favoured? The suggestion that he should be favoured because it is desirable to create a class of cultivating owners will not hold water, in view of the experience of the Duke of Bedford above quoted. Even in Ireland, in spite of the sentimental affection for the hereditary holding, some tenant purchasers are selling to moneylenders, who are re-letting at rack rents to new tenants.

Very similar considerations apply to the Liberal proposal to fix judicial rents for the benefit of sitting tenants. The members of the Cabinet in making this proposal do not seem to have paused to consider where it is leading them. Mr. Asquith in his speech at the National Liberal Club said that

the Government did not intend to set up the Irish system known as the 'three F's'—namely Fair rent, Fixity of tenure, and Free sale. But, as Lord Eversley has very clearly shown in another letter to 'The Times' (Oct. 2nd, 1913), any system of judicial rents must of necessity entail fixity of tenure and free sale. It is useless to tell the tenant that his rent is to be fixed at a particular figure if the landlord has the right to give him notice. Indeed, Mr. Lloyd George at Pwllheli said explicitly that the Government proposed to give

'a statutory assurance to the farmer that as long as he farms well he cannot be turned out of his holding wantonly and capriciously, and even when the landlord has an adequate excuse for wishing to change his tenant, unless that excuse is bad farming or the public interest, the landlord will have to pay not merely the full value of the improvements which the tenant has effected on his holding, but will have to pay damages for disturbing him in the faithful pursuit of the means of honourable livelihood.'

Leaving aside the rhetoric, this clearly means that the tenant is to be given the right to continue holding his farm; in other words, he is to be given the second of the three F's—Fixity of tenure. But suppose he falls ill and cannot cultivate his farm, it would be the height of cruelty to forbid him to sub-let to a neighbour or, if the arrangement were more convenient, to sell his right in the holding. And so the third of the three F's arises. The result is that the whole benefit of the judicial rent accrues to the existing tenant. As soon as he passes on his tenure, either by sub-letting or by sale, a new rent or interest charge comes into being in addition to the judicial rent, and this rent or interest charge is fixed not by judicial authority but by the law of supply and demand. Nothing has been accomplished except the transference by Act of Parliament of a certain amount of property from Mr. de Vere, a landlord, to Mr. Jones, a farmer; the farm itself remains subject to the law of supply and demand, and the only difference will be that the successor of Mr. Jones will pay two rents instead of one. Meanwhile the fixing of judicial rents will have given rise to many deluded hopes and bitter disappointments, and there will be farmers not a few who, remembering the kindly attitude of the old landlords, will curse the tyranny of the new Land Commission.

So much for the campaign so far as it affects farmers;

the question of labourers' wages raises other issues. Mr. Asquith bases his case for State intervention to fix wages on the allegation that no other means of securing an adequate wage for the labourer is available. In particular he mentioned the absence of trade unions; but that argument does not carry us very far. There are no trade unions among domestic servants, yet their wages have risen perhaps more rapidly than those of any other section of the wage-earning classes. Nor can it be alleged that there is a universal failure of economic forces to secure a living wage, and something over, for agricultural labourers. In many counties labourers obtain wages well above the standard which Ministers are apparently contemplating. At any rate, we find Mr. Lloyd George at Pwllheli taking pains to assure the tenant farmers of Carnarvonshire—who command many votes—that they were already paying such good wages that they had nothing to fear from a minimum-wage law. Yet, according to his statement, rents are high in Carnarvonshire although the land is poor and markets are distant. If Carnarvonshire can solve the problem, why not other counties? The mere statement of that question suggests that there are economic causes to explain the extraordinary variations which are found in the rates of farm wages in different counties. Doubtless custom also accounts for something, but it cannot account for everything. Indeed, when we come to examine the facts in detail it will be seen that wages fluctuate in all counties, moving both upwards and downwards, even on the same farms. In his valuable Report on Wages and Earnings of Agricultural Labourers, published in 1900 (Cd. 346), Mr. Wilson Fox tabulates the actual wages paid on particular farms in different counties over a long series of years. The variations are very striking. Take for example pp. 218 and 219 of the Report. One deals with Cheshire and the other with Nottinghamshire. On a farm at Chorley in Cheshire the weekly cash wages paid in June to ordinary agricultural labourers in receipt of full men's wages have risen steadily step by step from 9*s.* in the 'fifties to 17*s.* in the later 'nineties. On the other hand, on the Welbeck farms in Nottinghamshire the wages have fluctuated up and down. They started at 14*s.* in the 'fifties, dropped to 13*s.* 6*d.*, rose to 15*s.*, and continued to rise until they reached 18*s.* in the 'seventies; then dropped rapidly, till at the end of the

'eighties they stood again at 13*s.* 6*d.* for three years; since, they have risen steadily, and the latest figure given in this return is 16*s.* 6*d.* for 1899. In both counties the labourer receives other considerations besides his cash wages, but they are the main factor. Similar fluctuations will be found in every county, and the only possible inference is that, though custom may still affect agricultural wages, economic forces are far more potent.

That powerful economic forces are now at work to raise agricultural wages is notorious. The greater prosperity of agriculture tends to increase the competition of farmers for labourers, and simultaneously the activity of emigration tends to diminish the labour supply. Farmers are learning that if they want to keep their labourers they must pay more, and generally are paying more. In most counties wages have already risen above the subsistence line. Yet at a time when economic forces are happily enabling English labourers to enjoy something more than a bare subsistence, a Liberal Government—characteristically picking up socialist ideas twenty years after they are out of date—proposes to go back to the subsistence line as a standard for the whole country. The only precedent for this proposal is to be found in the old poor-law practice of making up the wages of farm hands to a sufficiency, measured in food, to provide for a family. The more recent legislative experiments of Wages Boards for sweated industries and the Miners' Minimum Wage Act form no precedent for the present proposal, for in neither case has any attempt been made to base wages on the cost of subsistence. The Sweated Industries Wages Board have based their findings on the economic possibilities of the industry, not on the prices of food and houses; the Miners' Wages Boards have equally been guided by economic considerations. But while a proposal to schedule agriculture in certain low-wages counties as a sweated industry would have been received with chilly silence, a good many votes may be won by turning Liberal lecturers loose upon the country to tell agricultural labourers that the Government means to raise their wages to a pound a week, or perhaps even 25*s.*, if they vote straight.

In addition to fixing the labourer's wage (or procuring his dismissal), the Liberal Government also proposes to build his cottage. The first comment to make upon this vast

undertaking is that it furnishes additional proof of the failure of Mr. Lloyd George's Budget. As was pointed out above, one of the promises made was that the Budget would lead to the building of more houses; yet after five years so great is the dearth of houses that the State has to undertake the duties of the speculative builder.

Not only has the Budget failed, as this confession proves, to stimulate the building of houses; it is itself responsible for the present deficiency.

On this point the evidence is overwhelming. The present writer has had the opportunity of examining nearly 500 replies received from different parts of the country by the Land Union in response to a circular letter asking about the condition of the building trade. With wearisome monotony the writers of these replies, who are mostly themselves engaged in the building trade, declare that building operations are almost at a standstill, and that the main cause is the sense of insecurity created by Mr. Lloyd George's Budget. People will not buy houses because they do not know what fresh burdens are to be placed on property owners; and if there are no buyers the speculative builder cannot recover his capital and therefore must cease to build. Bankers, again, will not advance money because of the diminished security offered by house property. Here is a sample letter from Bucks:

'My business is that of a cottage builder, principally five-roomed cottages let at 5s. a week clear, landlord paying rates and water. My work previous to 1909 was about 75 houses per annum, reduced to twenty-five houses in 1912.'

Another builder writes from Cornwall:

'Since the land taxes came into being I have not sold a single house.'

And another from the same county:

'Mortgage money is not procurable, persons are afraid to deal with house property securities for fear of this legislation and what may occur in the future.'

From Essex a builder writes:

'Previous to the Budget, cottage building was going on very rapidly, but at the present time I do not know of a single cottage being erected, although there is a great demand for renting the same.'

From Lincolnshire :

'People are under the impression that if they build they will not be fairly dealt with and therefore invest in other quarters out of the reach of unfair taxation.'

From Lancashire :

'The banks, which previously to the Budget were in the habit of advancing large sums, at present decline to advance on this kind of security. The result is that though there is a keen demand for houses there is a slump in building.'

From Yorkshire :

'Capitalists with money to invest will not put their money in property because if they should happen to make a profit the Government want 20 per cent. of the profit. They are therefore putting their money into other kinds of investments where the profit they make will be all their own.'

Quotations of this character could be made indefinitely. They show how enormous is the mischief that can be done by ill-considered legislation. The Liberal Government, first, by an insane system of taxation destroys the industry of the private builder, and then proposes to embark the credit of the State on the highly speculative business of cottage building. The financial prospects are appalling. The cottages built by the Government will certainly cost more, and probably very much more, than those put up by private builders or building companies. Directly the Government attempts to ask a rent sufficient to cover the cost of building and the cost of repairs, insurance, and rates, there will be a political outcry, and every Liberal candidate will be asked why English labourers should pay 5s. or 6s. a week for a cottage, when Irish labourers can get a cottage at the expense of the British exchequer for 1s. a week. The result will be a lowering of rents, heavy loss to the exchequer, and further discouragement to private builders.

The problem can be solved without State action if the politicians will be content to remove obstacles instead of creating them. The first requisite is the repeal of the land value duties. Their worst features would have been repealed by the Revenue Bill of last session, which the Government first proposed and then abandoned at the bidding of the single-taxers. If the speculative builder is allowed fair play

he is quite capable of meeting the requirements of the people, except in the more remote districts. Here the work must be undertaken by landowners and other persons of means, who from a sense of public spirit are willing to accept a low rate of interest on part of their capital in order to provide for their poorer neighbours cottages which will be a credit to the countryside. It is infinitely better to appeal to this widespread sense of public obligation than to create a vast Government Department for building and controlling the homes of the people.

Looking upon the new programme as a whole, it is impossible to resist the conviction that the one purpose underlying it is to buy votes. If it were not so, if the men who have devised these loud-sounding projects were really anxious to secure at once reforms which they allege to be urgent, they would not postpone their schemes till after a general election. The Unionist Party has offered no general opposition to the proposals of the Government. Many members of that party are quite as eager to play for the socialist vote as Mr. Lloyd George himself, and the party as a whole, having abandoned the agricultural interest so far as tariff reform is concerned, would certainly not dare to oppose any measure that could be even plausibly represented as advantageous to agriculture. If the real purpose of the Government were land reform and not electioneering, they would bring forward their proposals —which they say they have fully thought out—in the very next session of Parliament, so that the nation might receive the promised boon at least two years earlier.

EDITOR.

No. CCCCXLVIII. will be published in April.

The Edinburgh Review

APRIL, 1914 No. 448

THE ISSUE OF KIKUYU

1. **Ecclesia Anglicana. For what does she stand?** An open letter to the Right Reverend Father in God, EDGAR, Lord Bishop of St. Albans, by FRANK, Bishop of Zanzibar. Longmans, Green. 1914.
2. **The Kikuyu Conference.** A Study in Christian Unity, by J. J. WILLIS, Bishop of Uganda, together with the proposed scheme of Federation embodied in the Resolutions of Conference. Longmans, Green. 1914.
3. **The Missionary Conference in East Africa.** The Archbishop of Canterbury's answer to the 'Formal Appeal' made by the Bishop of Zanzibar. February, 1914. Macmillan.
4. **Kikuyu.** A Sermon by G. NAPIER WHITTINGHAM. Society of SS. Peter and Paul. 1914.
5. **The Miracle of Christianity.** A plea for 'The Critical School' in regard to the use of the Creeds. A letter to the Lord Bishop of Oxford from Professor BETHUNE-BAKER. Longmans, Green. 1914.

THE rapid expansion of the European Powers in Africa and Asia, made possible by facilities of intercourse which have had the effect of annihilating distance and bringing all the habitable globe within 'easy striking range,' is telling potently and in strange ways on the Christian Churches. Of these the most interesting, and the most interested, is the

All rights reserved.

Church of England. The controversy which has arisen in East Africa between Anglican Bishops, and has created so considerable a ferment in this country, really turns on the necessity, suddenly disclosed in Africa and coming to be realised in England, of deciding whether the Church of England is, or is not, a Protestant Church.

Two tendencies have been gathering force within the Church of England for some years past. Partly, as a consequence of the imperial expansion which has marked the last century, and, partly, as the proper effect of a genuinely religious revival, a keen interest in the evangelising of the non-Christian world has been present in all the non-Roman English Churches, and notably in the Mother Church, from which all the rest proceeded. Along with this evangelising tendency has gone the Tractarian movement of revolt against those conditions of the Church's life which were created by the Reformation, and especially against the legal Establishment which the Reformation made possible, and in a sense compelled. These two tendencies are now in collision, not indeed because there is necessarily any conflict between evangelistic enterprise and sacerdotalism, but because, in the actual circumstances of Christendom, a choice has to be made in the Mission Field between the methods of the Reformed and those of the Unreformed Churches, and because, however successfully the issue can be evaded at home, it must be faced abroad since there the Anglican Missionary finds himself facing the heathen alongside of Protestants who hail him as a brother, and of Papists who denounce him as a schismatic.

The same issue emerges from another source. Ever since the unity of medieval Christendom was shattered by the Reformation, the shame and weakness of religious anarchy have pressed heavily on the consciences of good Christians. Within recent years special circumstances have arisen to emphasise the desire for a restoration of external union. So rapid and so far-reaching has been the revolt of the modern world against the tradition of Christian Faith and Life, that Christendom appears to be threatened by a formal apostasy, the disastrous consequences of which it is impossible to contemplate without horror. This de-Christianised version of European civilisation has been transferred to the non-Christian

populations of Asia and Africa, and is beginning to affect them in modes and measures which must needs stir many forebodings in thoughtful and well-informed minds. The Churches therefore perceive a new urgency in the missionary task to which they are all committed, because there is apparent danger that, if this task be postponed or feebly undertaken, the native populations will be captured by the Secularism which is overtaking the nominally Christian nations of Europe and America. But an effective conduct of foreign missions presupposes unity among the missionaries, and this compels the Churches to realise their situation with respect to one another. In a word, the ' great divide ' of the Reformation has to be faced, and the basis of union has to be determined with respect to it. The Church of England, just because the circumstances of its reformation mitigated the shock and half-disguised the fact of the breach with medievalism, finds itself menaced by the sharpest internal conflict when it attempts to determine its course, and to realise its character.

Along quite another road the same necessity of realising the Church's character is plainly arising. The revolt against the traditional Christian theology, which in the Church of Rome has found expression in the movement of the ' Modernists,' proceeds universally in Christendom, and markedly in the Church of England, which is in profession, feeling, and system, a National Church, drawing to its membership, and retaining therein, a larger proportion of educated Englishmen than any other religious community. The controversies stirred by Bishop Colenso, and by the authors of ' Essays and Reviews ' more than a generation ago, resulted, thanks to the action of the civil courts, in the triumph of theological liberty, but there are reasons for thinking that the same issue will shortly again be raised, and that in circumstances which are by no means so favourable to freedom as might be supposed to be the case. Biblical criticism, now applied less to the Old than to the New Testament, seems to affect the very central beliefs of the Church, and tells directly on the authority of the Creeds, which are commended to Anglican acceptance on the precise ground that they ' may be ' proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture.' No Church can escape the necessity of determining its course with

respect to the novel teachings suggested by Biblical criticism. Will it meet theological innovation with the *non possumus* of a rigid traditionalism, and support such an attitude by dealing drastically with the innovators? That is the method of authority naturally adopted by the Roman Church, and requiring for its effective use nothing short of that infallibility which the Roman Church agrees to recognise in the Supreme Pontiff. Or, will it consent to consider new theories and teachings on their merits, judging them by their relation to evangelical principles rather than by their agreement with existing doctrinal definitions, assuming always the possibility of legitimate change, and holding liberty to be the very life-breath of such a reasonable faith as befits free and self-respecting Christians? That is the method of private judgment, proper to a Protestant Church which owes its being to, and finds its title to exist in, the exercise of private judgment. It is also the method of spiritual progress befitting Christian men, who believe in the guiding presence of the Spirit of Truth within the Christian Society, and within their own minds.

Thus evangelisation abroad, and intellectual activity at home, are driving the Church of England to decide whether it stands, as a Church, with the Reformation, or with the opponents of the Reformation, and whether it will act according to the requirement of its character.

The issue has been raised suddenly, and unexpectedly, in East Africa by the action of Dr. Weston, the Bishop of Zanzibar. The facts are generally known, and we may content ourselves therefore with the briefest summary. For some years past the missionaries in East Africa have been casting about for some *modus vivendi* between the divers organisations engaged in evangelistic work in those regions, in order that certain grave mischiefs may be averted, and a more effective propaganda of Christianity be carried on, among the native populations. This process came to a head last June, when a Conference of Christian Missionaries was held at Kikuyu, and some momentous decisions were taken. It is important to notice the gradual, and so to say natural, evolution of the Conference.

In an admirably lucid statement Dr. Willis, the Bishop of Uganda, has set before the public the objects of the Conference and its decisions. Nothing could be more reasonable in policy, or more Christian in temper. There was no question of 'giving

'away' the principles of Anglicanism, or of 'forcing the hand' of the home authorities.

'From 1907 onwards, through a series of public conferences and more private deliberations, the position has been carefully and often anxiously reviewed, and the movement towards a clearer understanding with one another has slowly gathered force.' . . .

'It has been consistently made clear that, from the Anglican point of view, we could enter on no scheme of Federation which had not the full consent of the ecclesiastical authorities of the Church of England, or which compromised our position as an integral part of the Anglican Communion. The setting up of an East African Church, independent of historic Christianity, was never for a moment contemplated.'

While thus the rights of the Anglican Communion as a whole were jealously guarded, the facts of the situation in East Africa were frankly faced.

'It is manifestly impossible for the Anglican Church, as at present represented, to occupy the entire field. British East Africa covers an area of some 182,000 square miles, or about half as large again as the United Kingdom. It contains a native population roughly estimated at 4,000,000, mainly Pagan to-day, but likely to become in the near future either Christian or Mohammedan. Apart from three chaplains to Europeans, the number of ordained clergy of the Church of England at present working in the Protectorate is twenty-three European and three native. Far stronger numerically are the representatives of the different denominations; where we cannot enter, they are prepared to work; where neither go, Islam has a clear field. Under the circumstances common sense would suggest a working agreement, by which unnecessary overlapping might be avoided, and the whole field occupied against a common foe.

'What might well be justified on the ground of necessity finds a further justification in the fact that in so much of essential doctrinal belief there is clear agreement between the missionaries. Every member of the proposed Federation would subscribe to a "loyal acceptance" of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds—a certain necessary liberty as to interpretation being understood—and of those Holy Scriptures on which their faith, no less than our own, is built up.'

After stating the specific provisions for securing an effective measure of co-operation, and laying the foundation for a larger measure of unity in the future, the Bishop proceeds:

'The celebration of the Holy Communion at the close of the Conference stands apart from any general scheme of Federation.

That it was celebrated in a church belonging to the Established Church of Scotland was due in a sense to the accident of place, no Church of England building being available. The service itself followed throughout the order in the Book of Common Prayer; the generosity was on the part of the Scotch Mission in lending their church for an English service. The admission of Nonconformists was certainly not without ample precedent. It was an exceptional occasion—an occasion which no one present is ever likely to forget. To repel at such a moment from a common participation might be justified by rule, and dictated by a stern sense of duty; but it would have been in a sense to nullify the whole spirit of the Conference. We cannot but feel that, in the circumstances, the Master Himself would have justified the action, as His Presence beyond all question hallowed the scene.'

We have quoted the Statement at such length because it is important that the proceedings at Kikuyu should be accurately understood. Neither the Conference, nor the 'common 'Communion' was an innovation in any true sense; both stand in line with the normal procedure of Anglican missionaries, and only go beyond precedent in so far as the circumstances of the East African situation are without exact parallel elsewhere in the world.

These proceedings, however, moved the deepest resentment in the mind of the Bishop of Zanzibar, who gave vigorous expression to his feelings in an 'Open Letter' to the Bishop of St. Albans entitled 'Ecclesia Anglicana. For what does she 'stand?' Instead of recognising the strictly normal character (at least so far as the principles at stake are concerned) of the happenings at Kikuyu, he insisted on regarding them as a portentous new departure, carrying consequences to the whole Anglican Communion of the most disastrous and far-reaching kind:

'I venture to say that there has not been a Conference of such importance to the life of the *Ecclesia Anglicana* since the Reformation. For it has brought us to the parting of the ways that we have so long dreaded and sought to avoid.'

This decisive issue is felt as a personal matter by the startled Bishop:

'To me the Conference is incomparably the most important thing in my life, except my consecration as Bishop. For it

challenges me in respect to my office as Bishop in a way that cannot be ignored or softened. I am compelled once and for all to ask myself, For what does a Bishop of the *Ecclesia Anglicana* stand? What is the Truth he has vowed to hand on to others?'

The sincerity of the writer is sufficiently proved by the strength of his emotions. He is evidently deeply moved, for he goes on to say that the proceedings at Kikuyu demonstrate 'the unfitness of the *Ecclesia Anglicana*, in her present state, 'for any serious or permanent mission work.'

'For we who deliver the whole Catholic Faith to our people are not only weakened by the heresy that is rife at home, we are here and now directly challenged to our faces by the two Bishops who are within easiest reach of us, and our cause is by them betrayed into the hands of our protestant neighbours. Our work is hindered, our witness stultified; we are made to appear as pretenders and impostors.'

This intolerable situation must be terminated at once:

'I have charged the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda with heresy in their teaching of the meaning and value of Episcopacy: I would also add that, to my mind, they and their followers are as seriously wrong in remaining in an Episcopal Ministry which is to them merely an outward form, and to their protestant neighbours a rock of offence.

'On the day that a Bishop can communicate with a protestant minister, deliberately and of set purpose, one of them is, it seems to me, bound in conscience to surrender the outward form which means so little to him, and yet so powerfully hinders the work of reunion.'

The indictment of the Church of England extends to three counts, affecting doctrine, worship, and missionary procedure, but the last is primary, because on it the very character of the Church really turns. When once the proceedings at Kikuyu have been authoritatively condemned, and the Church of England thus formally proved to have no part or lot with protestants, then it will be possible to deal with modernism, and to restore the cult of St. Mary! It is extremely suggestive that throughout the 'Open Letter' there is no allusion to the standards and formularies of the Church of England. The 'Reformation Settlement' is absolutely ignored, and the position of an Anglican Bishop is described as if there were neither an English Reformation in the past, nor a legal

Establishment in the present, to be reckoned with by the English Bishops:

'We Bishops of the *Ecclesia Anglicana* stand for the theory of the Universal Episcopate as opposed to the modern Papacy. In our official view each Bishop represents to his diocese the authority of the whole Church, delivering the Truth as it was received before the division between East and West, and appealing for support to every Catholic Bishop in every generation who has handed on this deposit faithfully: not frightened at this or that local addition, but joyfully welcoming the sound, universal doctrine faithfully preserved and taught in East and West. We appeal to those many thousands of Apostolic men long since passed to their rest, whose witness remains; we appeal to their Creed and Formulas, to their writings, and to the fruit of their labours, the living, truth-bearing Churches; we appeal to the great Bishops of the ancient *Ecclesia Anglicana*; we appeal to the living Bishops of East and West whose testimony to the dogmas they have received is evident to all. Our unhappy disunion with the Patriarchs of the West and East does not hinder us from falling back upon their public witness to what Holy Church has received and taught all down the ages: and in the strength of their witness, patiently waiting for that power of the Spirit which shall clear up the present trouble about the claims of the See of Peter, we should be powerful enough to resist the temptation to make common cause with the protestant bodies and the modernising party.'

His final appeal to the Bishop of St. Albans runs thus:

'Finally, my Lord, I beg you and all my brethren of the Province of Canterbury to see to it that, whatever liberty it may be thought wise to give to individuals in speculation and unofficial discussion, and whatever variations it may be judged good to allow in ceremonial and the like, the *Ecclesia Anglicana*, as represented by her Episcopate, gives forth a clear unwavering testimony to the Truth as it was received by, and accepted in, the Universal College of Catholic Bishops from the days of St. Peter down to the Great Schism, and as it has been ever since preserved and maintained in common by the three divisions of that one College, with which we are to-day so unhappily familiar.'

It has seemed well to quote the Bishop's words at some length, not only in fairness to him, but also because nothing but a lengthy quotation would indicate adequately the astonishing conception he has formed of his office as an Anglican Bishop. It is almost pathetic to contrast with this lofty language the actual terms of the Act of Parliament under which the Bishop received consecration, and which gives him

'spiritual jurisdiction over the congregations of the United 'Church of England and Ireland, and *over such other Protestant 'congregations as may be desirous of placing themselves under his 'or their authority'* (vide 5 Vict. c. 6, sect. 2). His horror of protestantism might well seem grotesque in the case of one who holds office in a Church which historically is the most illustrious of the Protestant Churches, and which includes within its communion churches which profess and call themselves Protestant. The 'Protestant Episcopal Church of 'Scotland' is the legal description of the Scottish Episcopal Church, and the Preface to the Scottish Canons in 1839 did not scruple to speak of 'the Protestant bishops in Scotland.' The 'Protestant Episcopal Church in America' has not yet agreed to alter its title, while the Church of Ireland, which, before the Disestablishment, formed what the Act of Union called 'one protestant episcopal church' with the Church of England, was careful after Disestablishment to declare itself 'a reformed and Protestant Church' holding communion with 'the sister Church of England, and with all other Christian 'Churches agreeing in the principles of this Declaration.' The Church of England is thus entangled beyond recovery in the fellowship of Protestant Churches, and can only cease to be Protestant by a twofold violence, stultifying the past and sterilising the present. It is, of course, not necessary to deny the 'Catholic' character of the Church of England in order to affirm, what indeed the plain facts compel us to affirm, that the Church of England is, in the full sense of the word, a Protestant Church. Even so cautious a 'High' Churchman as the late Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Stubbs, while emphasising what he described as the 'full Catholic character' of the English Church, felt compelled to dissociate himself sharply from such a position as that expressed in the Bishop of Zanzibar's 'Open 'Letter':

'I would in the strongest way condemn the idea that would repudiate the name of Protestant as a mere name of negation, as well as the notion that the maintenance of Protestant negation is the whole or the most important part of our religious work and history. I should unhesitatingly reject the theory that regards Protestantism by itself, either at home or abroad, as a religious system devoid of spiritual constructive energy.

'Protestantism liberated in the age of the Reformation forces of religious working which had been long cramped and depressed.

It was not done without much of the risk of reaction ; it was done with much waste of time and strength and logic ; and with much loss of charity, as is exemplified in the controversial struggles which have gone on, within and without its area, ever since.

'But it was done. Theology, even through the miserable caricature of controversy, began the great work of realising the truth and efficacy of the Word of God. Even the rivalry of competing and contending confessions deepened and widened the knowledge of the law of God. One to another and to the watching Churches, the bearers of the light ministered light even through the contention and strife which by God's grace were kept from extinguishing it. And the missionary work of the Gospel gained, it may be surely said, more than it lost ; far off as we still may be from that manifestation of unity in which the world shall know the message of Him who was sent for the saving of it. It cannot be maintained that Protestantism, even in its most meagre aspect, can be regarded as outside the discipline by which good has been worked within and without the Church in the changes of the years of the right hand of the Most Highest.'

(*vide* Fourth Visitation Charge, May and June 1899.)

This is careful and balanced language. It cannot be said to disclose much sympathy with the Protestant point of view : indeed, it hardly conceals a strong personal dislike for it. But it is the language of a bishop who was also an historical scholar of the first eminence, and whose prejudices were not wholly suffered to escape from the discipline of his knowledge. The Bishop of Zanzibar allows nothing for history. His judgment of the past and of the present is dominated by a theory which, it is absolutely certain, has never been realised on this earth, and never will be.

But the Bishop of Zanzibar does not stand alone. He has given expression, crudely and violently but not unfaithfully, to a conception of Anglicanism which is widely represented in the ranks of the clergy. The Reformation is repudiated : the Establishment is ignored. It is assumed that the Church of England has carried on unaltered the entire medieval tradition save for the fact, of doubtful religious advantage, of withdrawing from obedience to the Roman Pontiff. The Church is governed, not by the law, but by the bishops, and these are bound by the general agreement of the existing episcopate, of which the greatest part belongs to the Roman Church ! Thus the suppression of certain devotions borrowed from contemporary Roman practice is resented as a wrong inflicted on the faithful, the more intolerable since the

oppression is the work of the bishops, whose primary duty it is to guard the full Catholic heritage of their flocks! The Bishop of St. Albans, having suppressed an exceptionally audacious attempt to introduce into the parish churches of his diocese some Mariolatrous devotions, is rebuked with much asperity:

'It is quite intolerable, my Lord, that you in England should send us out to the labour and suffering of isolated missionary work, expecting us to conquer Islam and heathenism, and in their place to create a living, catholic Church; while you yourselves are at no evident pains to defend the traditions of the Catholic Church from erroneous speculations and interpretations, but rather set yourselves to attack and abolish practices of piety which have the sanction of the whole of Catholic Christendom.'

The Bishop of Zanzibar writes as if some wrong were being inflicted on himself when the law is enforced in England:

'Why are we missionary bishops placed in a position in which, behind our backs, the faith and practice of the Catholic Church can be modified and altered?'

Such words (we may observe in passing) disclose an uncomfortable prospect for English churchmen. Colonial and missionary bishops are many, and they are appointed in many ways, and for many reasons. If they, by their inherent authority as Catholic Bishops, are to 'call the tune' for the Established Church at home, overriding the statutes under which it exists and which determine its government, the nation may fairly question whether the conditions of Establishment have not been so radically altered as to destroy all security for any regard being paid to the national will in matters religious.

The Archbishop of Canterbury made no delay in dealing with the accusations against the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda. As soon as the Bishop of Zanzibar had arrived in England, and cast on his 'Open Letter' such additional light as he could personally contribute, the Primate's decision was announced.

'After careful consideration of the documents which have been laid before me, of the correspondence which has passed between myself and those concerned, and of the verbal statements made to me by the Bishops of Uganda and of Zanzibar, I am unhesitatingly of opinion that I should not be justified in allowing the inquiry,

which is, I think, essential, to take the suggested form of proceedings against the Bishops of Uganda and Mombasa for heresy and schism. I do not dwell upon the fact that no clear precedent exists for the procedure which ought to be followed if a missionary bishop, whose diocese is not at present part of a provincial organisation, were placed on his trial on such a charge. If the trial were one which ought to take place, a precedent for the procedure would have to be created, and I should be ready to take the necessary steps. But the facts before me afford no case for such proceedings.'

The charges of heresy and schism being thus disposed of, the Archbishop turns to the practical questions raised by the proceedings at Kikuyu: these will be referred in the first instance to the Central Consultative Committee of the Lambeth Conference, and with the assistance of such advice as that august body may offer him, the Archbishop undertakes to give his personal decision.

The two questions referred to the Committee are framed thus:

'1. Do the provisions of the proposed Scheme contravene any principles of Church Order, the observance of which is obligatory upon the Bishops, the Clergy, and the lay-workers of the Church of England at home and abroad?

'2. Whether, due consideration being given to precedent and to all the circumstances of the case, the action of the bishops who arranged and conducted the admittedly abnormal Service in question was, in the opinion of the Consultative Body, consistent or inconsistent with principles accepted by the Church of England.'

To the surprise of the public, and, it must needs be thought, to the great embarrassment of his friends, the Bishop of Zanzibar, instead of waiting for the verdict thus promised, addressed to the Archbishop a long and vehemently worded protest against the procedure which had been announced, and even challenged the Archbishop's personal competence to adjudicate as having disclosed a mind already made up against him! One phrase in the Primate's statement moved him deeply. His Grace had referred to the non-episcopal churches, (whom the Bishop himself had brusquely described as 'protestant bodies whose very existence is hostile to Christ's 'Holy Church') as 'different branches of the Church of 'Christ'!

'Your Grace will, I am sure, pardon me if I point out that this phrase implies the validity of the ministries of the bodies in question, and the use of it by your Grace, in an official pronouncement, justifies the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda in all that they proposed and did at the Kikuyu Conference.'

Accordingly, the Bishop repudiates in advance the decision which is to be given by the very authority to which he was supposed to have himself appealed, or at least makes his acceptance contingent on his own approval! And this, apparently, in the interest of 'Catholic' Order!

'I know that your Grace agrees with me that a diocesan Bishop is not bound by the fiat of his Metropolitan; and, indeed, your Grace has gone so far as to rule that I am not in your province; so that whatever decision your Grace may finally give is in danger of being set at nought by one party to the case or the other. It is true that the Bishop of Uganda has consented to follow whatever direction your Grace may give him; it is equally true that I informed your Grace at the outset that for myself I could accept no decision coming from the Archbishop of Canterbury alone. Unless, then, the two Bishops are found to be faultless by an authority that is beyond question, it is clear that I shall still be in the position of having to determine for myself whether I can remain in communion with them or not; and it was to extricate myself from this position that I appealed to your Grace, and your com-provincial Bishops.'

If the Bishop of Zanzibar stood alone, this extraordinary behaviour might be set down to the eccentricity of an individual, and possibly to the disturbing effects of a notoriously unwholesome climate; but, as we have already pointed out, he does not stand alone. Not only is the 'Open Letter' a representative document, but, since its author's arrival in this country, considerable numbers of the clergy are associating themselves publicly with the position which it maintains. Half the clergy in London have subscribed a memorial to the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury begging their 'Spiritual Fathers' to make it plain that, 'in accordance with 'the teaching of the Church in all ages, the Church of England 'has always taught, and must continue to teach, the *necessity* 'of Episcopal Ordination as a condition of exercising the 'Ministry of the Word and Sacraments.' This is represented as a 'principle' which can only be let slip at the heavy cost of compromising the character of the Church of England

'as a true part of Christ's Holy Catholic Church.' London is offering a lead to the other dioceses. It will be interesting to see what proportion of the English clergy will follow it.

It may, indeed, be doubted whether most of those who subscribe to the 'necessity' of episcopacy realise the full consequences of that amazing dogma, or would be prepared to accept such a doctrine of 'inherent episcopal authority' as that which is pleaded as the justification of the Bishop of Zanzibar's proceedings. Both the Bishop of Winchester, who as chairman of the Universities' Mission stands in a specially close relation to the Bishop of Zanzibar, and the Bishop of Oxford, who with characteristic impulsiveness hastened to announce through the columns of 'The Times' that the proceedings at Kikuyu were so 'intolerable' to men of his way of thinking as to threaten a secession, would hesitate long before they themselves spoke of the great non-episcopal churches, which sustain six-sevenths of the whole burden of the foreign missions carried on by the non-Roman churches of the West, as 'protestant bodies whose very existence is 'hostile to Christ's Holy Church.' Both those eminent prelates were members of the Edinburgh Missionary Conference: both are conspicuous supporters of the 'Student Volunteer Move-'ment': both are honourably known for their zeal in the cause of Foreign Missions: both have been publicly associated with Nonconformists in the advocacy of many righteous causes. The Bishop of Zanzibar's crude and tyrannous phraseology must be very shocking to them, as to every genuinely religious man whose conscience is not confused by the dolorous obsessions of fanaticism. But, questions of taste and good feeling being put aside, it cannot be doubted that the two bishops, and all who share their assumption of the *necessity* of episcopacy—not its great practical value, or its illustrious past, or its noble promise, which are the common acceptance of all Anglicans and of many non-Anglicans, but its *necessity*—are committed to the theory maintained by the Bishop of Zanzibar, and ultimately to the consequences of that theory. Let any candid and considering man read such a relatively authoritative statement of the 'Anglican doctrine 'of the Church' as that contributed to Dr. Hastings' great 'Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics' by Dr. Darwell Stone, and ask himself whether it does not properly compel

such a practical application as that which the Bishop of Zanzibar proposes in his 'Open Letter.' The authority of that Encyclopædia is deservedly so great that English churchmen may well feel some astonishment, and much regret, that a version of Anglican doctrine should be set forward there, which is assuredly incapable of support from the standards and precedents of the English Church, and would be eagerly disavowed by many, perhaps by most, of its members. It is not without significance that the learned author of that article never makes a single allusion either to the Reformation, or to any of the authorised formularies of the Church of England, or to any of the classical writers of Anglicanism, but contents himself with appending under the head of 'Literature' the names of ten modern writers, including himself, all of whom, with the exception of a Russian, are well known 'High Churchmen'! The unconscious arrogance of the neo-Tractarians could hardly be more impressively illustrated. One sentence from Dr. Stone's article indicates, what would otherwise be hard to discern, the difference between his doctrine and that of the Roman Church. With little alteration it might serve to indicate also the fatal defect of the theory which he miscalls 'Anglican':

> 'to maintain that a necessity of Unity is external inter-communion having its centre in *the Pope of Rome* fails to allow for the lack of Scriptural and historical basis for a view of the *Papacy* which makes outward adherence to it an essential part of the Church's life.'

Substitute the Bishop of Zanzibar's 'Universal College of 'Catholic Bishops' for 'the Pope of Rome,' and 'Episcopacy' for 'the Papacy,' and not a syllable ceases to be true. It is only by ignoring the true character of the Reformation, and belittling its consequences, that the Church of England can be separated from 'the other Protestant Churches'—the expression is that deliberately adopted by the Convocation of Canterbury in 1689—and it is only by leaving out of reckoning the last four centuries of Christian history, and silently excluding from the description of historic Christianity the non-episcopal churches, that any pretence for an historical basis for the *necessity* of Episcopacy can be made.

Let any candid and considering English churchman think

out the practical consequences of the doctrine which is thus expressed in the final paragraph of Dr. Stone's article :

'As the existence of the State is necessary if the individual is to realise and give effect to his social and political capacities, so the Church is needed if the Christian is not to be maimed in his personal character and work. An isolated man is incapable of full human life, and an isolated Christian necessarily lacks something of Christianity. To live the complete Christian life, to participate in the full Christian worship, to possess and actualise the full Christian knowledge, requires membership in the Christian society. And it is not any kind of society which can properly supply the needs thus indicated. The episcopal ministry, which is the mark down the ages of the historic Church, and at the present time the common possession of Easterns, Roman Catholics, and Anglicans, is much more than a part of outward organisation. It is the link whereby the society which possesses it is connected with the past history and present life of the Church ; and it affords the possibility of that complete sacramental system which is the covenanted means of the union of Christians with the Lord and head of the Church.'

This is the careful language of a learned divine, writing from the calm seclusion of the Pusey House at Oxford, but the theory it is designed to state has too often to be applied to human life by half-educated clergymen, of strong prejudices and limited experience, in the parishes of the country. The Bishop of Zanzibar's 'Open Letter' shows sufficiently how it can affect the 'comity of Missions' in the face of the unchristianised millions of Asia and Africa. It bluntly declares that apart from the episcopal ministry, there is not even the 'possibility' of that complete sacramental system which is the covenanted 'means of the union of Christians with the Lord and head of 'the Church'! Happily, men are better than their formal beliefs, and life corrects the crudities of theories which were irresistible in the study. Nevertheless, the rapid extension of this exalted episcopalianism among the English clergy is a grave circumstance, and threatens the National Church with some very serious consequences.

It commits the clergy themselves to an essentially false position. Be the merits of the episcopalian theory what they may, it is certain that on that theory the English Reformation cannot be justified, and the English Establishment cannot be maintained. If the verdict of the universal episcopate is properly final in the twentieth century, it could not have been less so in the sixteenth : but nothing is more certain than that

the proceedings of the English Reformers were then, as the results of those proceedings are still, utterly abhorrent to the 'Catholic' episcopate generally. Indeed, even the local episcopate was so hostile to the Elizabethan settlement that it had to be removed by a bold stretch of Royal Prerogative, and its place filled by a new episcopate more complaisant and less authoritative. While, therefore, the episcopalian theory compels the English clergyman to regard with disgust the circumstances in which the Church of England achieved its independence, it also brings him hopelessly into collision with the existing system of the National Establishment. For, in point of fact, the law of the English Church prohibits much that the majority of 'Catholic' Bishops approve and practise; and such deference to the latter as the Bishop of Zanzibar passionately insists upon, can only be rendered at the cost of deliberate and continuing disobedience to the former. Yet it is the authority of the law, and not that of the Catholic Bishops, which alone has validity within this realm, and which alone is capable of being enforced in the courts.

More serious, because essentially degrading, is the moral confusion in which the episcopalian theory immerses the clergy who accept it. They hold office on specific conditions which they must needs explain away: they swear canonical obedience to bishops whom, none the less, they must perpetually disobey: they must constantly use a prayer-book, which is so glaringly defective from the episcopalian point of view, that they must subject it to the most violent handling to make it serve their turn. They are compelled to accustom themselves to a whole set of subterfuges, in order to effect some kind of a plausible reconciliation between their situation as ministers of a National Church professing the 'Protestant Reformed 'Religion established by Law,' and the fancy picture of themselves as priests of a 'Catholic' Church governed by the 'Uni-'versal College of Catholic Bishops.' This normal confusion tells on their public ministry at every point, and always for evil. They are out of sympathy with their own Church, out of touch with their own Nation, out of accord with their own Bishop. The exalted episcopalianism of their professions goes along with the naked congregationalism of their practice. The paradox is too gross for personal self-respect; too manifest for public credit.

Nor is there any security in the position which by so many devious devices, and at so heavy a cost, they have made for themselves. They are in a state of unstable equilibrium, caught in the current of a remorseless logic which at any moment may break down the artificial barriers of their fantastic theory, and sweep them into Rome. It is common knowledge that within recent years the old Tractarian attitude towards the Roman Church has been largely abandoned, and that a new school of Anglicans has arisen which affects Roman modes of speech and thought, and frankly declares reunion with the unreformed and impenitent Roman Church to be its aim. In his inimitable manner, the most brilliant of the younger members of this Romanising party, Mr. Ronald Knox, confesses at once his disgust with the older Anglicanism, and his clear vision of his own religious direction. He pictures his typical layman, whom he calls Jones, as about to give place to a generation less conservative and more logical:

'His sons or his grandsons will find out the straight path; straight, because it is the simplest way of accomplishing your journey; straight, because the whole business of faith is not picking and choosing your way, or looking out for sign-posts, but having the pertinacity to follow your nose; *straight, because after all the road is very largely Roman.* In our country, the country of compromises, the roads will dodge in and out, skirting respectfully the domain of some territorial magnate, softening down hills by gentle windings, and wandering a mile or two out of their course before they pluck up courage to cross a river. It is picturesque, certainly; doubt is always picturesque, but the *straight, logical, business-like road of the continent is the true type of all our pilgrimage.*'

(*vide* 'Some Loose Stones,' p. 217.)

The Bishop of Manchester, from quite another point of view, is in agreement with his brilliant son:

'A younger generation is attracted by the apparent security of Rome, is dismayed by the lengths to which Modernism has gone, and finds no logical half-way house between unbelief and unquestioning acceptance of the authority of the Church—that is, the Roman Church. It takes for granted that the revival of Roman or semi-Roman observances, to which for more than a generation High Churchmen have sometimes lent their authority, sometimes their connivance, had for its object preparation of the way for reunion with Rome. But observances are nothing without the faith which they symbolise. If the Articles and Prayer Book honestly admit of semi-Roman interpretation, why should they

not admit of a still more Catholic—that is, a Roman construction ? If we have altars, why not say the Mass at them, instead of the exceedingly unsuitable office provided in the Prayer Book ? '
(*vide* ' Sacrifice or Sacrament,' p. viii.)

Certainly, if ' the great majority of Catholic Bishops ' can rightly override the law of the English Church in such matters as the Invocation of Saints, Purgatory, the Cult of St. Mary, and the like, it is hard to dispute its competence to override that law in the matter of the papal claims. The ' undivided ' Church ' of the Tractarians has been found so patently futile as an authority for modern use, that it has perforce been combined with the existing authority of the universal episcopate, and *this* points so definitely in the direction of Rome, that a serious acceptance of it must needs bring the pilgrim to that haven.

If the logical compulsion Romewards implied merely the secession of individuals, its effect on the National Church would be comparatively slight ; but since it has its principal influence on the procedure of clergymen who continue to hold office in the parishes, the broad effect is very considerable and very unfortunate. For the Romanising of the practical system is driving a wedge between the National Church and the public conscience, and preparing the way for a dramatic collapse of the Establishment by destroying confidence in the nation, and creating in many minds a positive hostility to the doctrine and practice which the Establishment has come to embody. Add that the clergy themselves in considerable numbers are necessarily out of accord with the national idea which Establishment expresses, and it is not difficult to see that the resisting power of the Church of England is rapidly wasting against the day when the attack on its legal position shall be seriously undertaken.

Meanwhile, from a wider point of view, the effect of the new Anglicanism is extremely unfortunate. At home it prohibits united action of the Christian forces within the nation ; abroad it ties the English Church to an isolation, difficult to maintain and impossible to justify. For just so far as the conception of Anglicanism expressed in the Bishop of Zanzibar's ' Open ' Letter ' is accepted by the clergy of the English Church, whether working as missionaries among non-Christian peoples, or as evangelists in Canada and Australia, to that extent

will those clergy be committed to a resolute refusal to co-operate with any Protestant Church; while not less certainly will they continue to be exiled from the fellowship of the Roman Church. The Anglican Communion in fact, under the pretence of 'Catholicism,' is being committed to a completely sectarian position. However ample its communion may be in theory—and we know that in theory it is in full communion with 'the 'Universal College of Catholic Bishops'—in practice it must needs pinch the Catholic Church within its own narrow limits.

There is now in all quarters a very frank admission of the disastrous effects of the isolation to which none the less the Church of England is ever more evidently committed. But the root of the mischief is still cherished, and its character resolutely disguised. Let it be stated as clearly as possible, and repeated on every suitable occasion, that so long as ordination by bishops is insisted upon as a *sine quâ non* of valid ministry, there is no possible result of negotiations save the too familiar result of exasperation and disappointment.

Take the situation in Canada, where many circumstances have made the union of the Protestant Churches eminently desirable. It seems indeed impossible to find anywhere a field more favourable to effective unity. The evangelisation of the immense areas of the North-West, into which the colonists are coming with startling rapidity, is a task altogether beyond the resources of any single Church: and the character of the immigrants, belonging largely to those sections of the British and American populations, which sit most loosely to specific denominational systems, makes the prospect of combined religious effort unusually hopeful. In point of fact there is a project of union between the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregationalist Churches, which is far advanced towards completion. Its success and its final character must really turn on the action of the Church of England in Canada. Strong enough to hinder, and indeed make impossible, the religious unity of the non-Roman Churches, Anglicanism is altogether too weak to have the smallest prospect of becoming itself accepted as the Church of Canada. This is clearly seen by many Canadian churchmen, and freely confessed, yet none the less the *non possumus* attitude is maintained, and every approach to closer relations with the other Protestant Churches is shipwrecked on the rock of the episcopal claim. While the merits

of the episcopal government are more readily conceded, as experience discloses the practical inconvenience of other polities for the purposes of ecclesiastical life over such vast areas, the dogma of the spiritual necessity of this one polity becomes ever more repulsive. It has the intellectual and moral weakness of the Roman claim without its considerable historical and actual recommendations. The suggestion that the ministry of non-episcopal Churches, which have been the principal instruments through which Christianity has been sustained among the vast communities of the New World, is destitute of spiritual authority, lying 'without the Covenant,' having no certainty of Divine Blessing on its labours, is so shocking to the Christian conscience that few men, however bigoted, can be found openly to make it. None the less it is perceived that precisely that suggestion is implicit in the Anglican refusal to recognise the non-episcopal churches, and the fact stirs a resentment which, often unexpressed, is yet always present, and affects for ill the whole process of society. The refusal of episcopacy is almost inevitably raised to the level of a religious principle, since to accept episcopacy on its own theory seems to imply a repudiation of the plainest lessons of experience, and to immerse Protestant Christians in a kind of treason to the Reformation. Whatever the Lambeth Conference may have intended by insistence on the 'Historic Episcopate' as one of the four conditions of Reunion, it has been generally understood to have meant insistence on the sole validity of an episcopal ministry, and, therefore, though a whole generation has passed away since the famous 'Quadrilateral' was launched on the world, it has remained absolutely barren of effect.

But it will be urged with great force that the national establishment of the Church of England is quite manifestly incompetent to cover the ground of modern Anglicanism; that the new prominence of the episcopate is but the inevitable consequence of the transformation of an insular into a world-wide communion; that the attempt to extend the machinery created for a National Church three centuries ago to the colonial and missionary Churches of our own time is intrinsically irrational and must break down. All this must be conceded, while at the same time it is maintained that whatever new arrangements may have to be devised to meet the novel demands of the Anglican Communion must conform in point of essential

principle to the parent system. It may be taken for granted that the episcopate must play a greater part in the colonial and missionary Churches than it has played in the Church of England, and indeed it is obvious that the bishops will be the normal and almost indispensable links of denominational fellowship between Anglican communities scattered widely over the globe, and separated from one another by many circumstances of race, climate, and condition. All this renders it the more imperative that there should be a clear understanding as to the conception of the episcopate which is accepted within the Anglican Communion. Does the Bishop of Zanzibar interpret truly the mind of the English Church, or does the Bishop of Uganda do so? Is the 'Open Letter' to pass into history as one of the Anglican standards, or will the proceedings at Kikuyu be seen in the retrospect to have disclosed the true spirit of Anglicanism? In a word, are the Anglican Bishops the chief ministers of a Protestant Church, or are they members of 'the Universal College of Catholic 'Bishops,' in such wise that they are *ipso facto* required to accept whatever 'the majority of Catholic Bishops' approve and practise? Are they primarily the leaders of a living Church, or are they primarily the guardians of an unalterable tradition?

The Bishop of Zanzibar challenges the proceedings at Kikuyu, not merely because he regards them as essentially sinful, but because he is anxious to make his position secure for an attack on what he calls 'Modernism.' It is only, he says, as 'the Catholic Church in England,' and true to that character, that we can 'show a united front against Modern-'ism,' our 'most deadly danger.' Accordingly, 'the *Ecclesia* '*Anglicana* needs at once to choose between the liberty of 'heresy and the duty of handing on the Faith as she received 'it.' Writing in this strain, he draws a formidable picture of the Apocalypse of deadly heresy represented by a recent volume of Essays, styled 'Foundations,' published by some of the younger Oxford divines, and already widely circulated.

'The chief value of the book is not in its theology nor its philosophy; but rather in the revelation it affords of the official attitude of the Bishops implicated towards heresy and unorthodox speculation.'

What he desires, and passionately insists upon, is the prompt suppression of such theological speculations as those represented by 'Foundations,' and the establishment by episcopal authority of strait limits within which all theological thought is to be henceforward confined.

Now, it is not necessary to be in agreement with the views set forth, temperately and reverently, as all must admit, by the Seven Oxford Men who have combined to write 'Foundations,' in order to dissent decisively from the *rôle* which the Bishop of Zanzibar proposes to the bishops as defenders of the Faith. No consistent member of a Reformed and Protestant Church can ever approve such a method of handling novel teachings. The Reformation proceeded on a different principle. Not the stolid endorsement of the tradition as they had received it, but a courageous criticism of it, and on the basis of such criticism a large revision of it, was the method of the Reformers. Every time the Convocations assemble for debate they join in a prayer which implies a point of view essentially different from that of the 'Open Letter.'

'Concede igitur ut Spiritus tuus, qui Concilio olim Apostolico, huic nostro etiam nunc insideat, ducatque nos in omnem veritatem, quae est secundum pietatem: Ut qui, ad amussim sanctae Reformationis nostrae, errores, corruptelas, et superstitiones olim hic grassantes, Tyrannidemque Papalem, merito et serio repudiavimus, Fidem Apostolicam et vere Catholicam firmiter et constanter teneamus omnes, Tibique rite puro cultu intrepidi serviamus, per Jesum Christum, Dominum et Servatorem nostrum.'

This prayer suggests a far nobler conception of duty than that which restricts itself to a monotonous policy of anathema with respect to every teaching which is new, and, because new, unfamiliar and unwelcome. The reference to the Reformation is specially significant as indicating a process far wider in its scope than a mere repudiation of the Papacy. The method of dealing with the 'Modernists' in the Roman Church does not commend itself to Protestant Englishmen, even the most conservative in matters doctrinal, as either right in itself, or calculated to serve the permanent interest of Christian truth, or in the long run likely to add strength to the Christian Church. In such essays of orthodox violence as marked the English Church during the last century, no effectual bar was placed to the advance of new ideas, but a heavy cloud of discredit

was brought upon the Church of England. It will not be found so easy to create a religious panic among English churchmen to-day as it was when 'Essays and Reviews' shocked orthodox minds, or when Bishop Colenso's opinions on the Pentateuch were received with an explosion of resentment. The Bishop of Zanzibar represents a point of view which is Roman, not Anglican, and discloses a temper which is no longer normal among religious people.

If, therefore, the bishops, and not the law courts, are to be the judges of doctrine within the Anglican Communion, and to wield the truly formidable power of staking out the limits of religious thinking for the English clergy, it is essential that the Church should know in what character they propose to address themselves to the fulfilment of their awful duty. It is of little service to say shortly with the Bishop of Zanzibar that 'if the student sees in the limits imposed by the Creeds 'the boundaries of accurate thinking upon God, let him go 'where he will, and say what he please,' for the creeds can have no greater authority than Scripture gives them, and are patently susceptible of various interpretations. One of the creeds, the so-called Athanasian Creed, the absence of which from the provisional agreement effected at Kikuyu moves the Bishop's indignation, is openly criticised as misleading, if not actually untrue, in some of its statements, and this not merely by irresponsible 'heretics' but by eminent and respected Bishops. What the Church needs to be assured of is that serious arguments will be seriously met, that real difficulties will be honestly admitted, and that devout and competent students shall have such a measure of liberty as is properly indispensable for their invaluable work. Every Church must accept the risks of inadequate government; but no Protestant Church can accept the authority of a government which repudiates responsibility, and limits itself to enforcing the decisions of a past which neither possessed our knowledge nor was confronted by our problems. The one precedent of Christian history which never loses its relevance to ecclesiastical conditions is that of courageous innovation; the one warning of Christian history which may never wisely be forgotten is that conveyed by the reiterated failure of intolerance.

Dr. Hort has drawn from the record of the apostolic age conclusions which every successive age does but emphasise,

when he says that 'the lesson-book of the Ecclesia, and of 'every Ecclesia, is not a law but a history.' And that history, we may add, is not to be limited arbitrarily to the first four centuries, or to the first six, or to the Middle Ages, or to the post-Reformation epoch; but must be read as a continuing revelation, partly already on record, partly in the process of being recorded, partly still awaiting disclosure in the future. Bishops can only be accepted as competent judges and rulers if it be known that they are reverent and teachable disciples of history, as well as devout guardians of a tradition. What Lord Acton said of history generally, is specially true of history as the instrument of religious knowledge, and the discipline of religious judgment: 'History compels us to fasten on 'abiding issues, and rescues us from the temporary and 'transient.' The facile panics of orthodox theologians are as superfluous as they are discreditable. Time can be trusted to sift the opinions of men; the truth which is worth preserving does not need to be shielded from questioning, and made exempt from discussion.

'Modernism,' like every other human achievement, is a mingled thing, not wholly trustworthy, not wholly to be condemned. The proper business of the Church's leaders is not to stimulate 'heresy-hunts' against individuals, but to raise the standard of intellectual honesty and religious living in themselves first, and next in the society which they are appointed to rule. There are, of course, limits which no liberty which is something more than mere licence would seek to transgress, and which certainly no Christian Church could rightly permit to be transgressed. If the necessity of enforcing these should ever arise, the bishops could count on the willing support of all considering Churchmen in taking whatever action might seem to be necessary; but of these limits there is no question in the case of devout and candid students like the authors of 'Foundations.' They surely deserve episcopal encouragement rather than episcopal censure, for even if their specific theories be found unacceptable, they will have facilitated by their labours the very process of study and thought which will correct their errors. They are at least performing this great service to the Church: that they are preventing the breach between modern knowledge and traditional theology from growing too wide to be bridged, and proving to the most

suspicious that Christianity maintains its claim to embrace all truths. It is not their achievements that matter, but themselves and their efforts. For the rest, suppression of honest error by the action of authority has always in the past failed to serve the purpose for which it was undertaken; while it always lowers the level of sincerity within the Church. It is humiliating, indeed, that it should seem to have become necessary to insist on such a postulate of Protestantism in a Church which could once be proudly and justly described by her sons as 'the beauty and crown of the Reformation.'

While thus the interest of truth stands to lose by such a return to the discredited method of authority in handling opinion as the Bishop of Zanzibar insists upon, the interest of Christian unity is thereby nowise really served. If ever the Christian Society is to achieve again an effective measure of external unity, it can never be by returning to the merely political conception of the Church which was definitely abandoned at the Reformation, and has now through the advance of civilisation during the last four centuries become completely impracticable. Even if by some unimaginable miracle the Bishop of Zanzibar could realise his dream of a church governed *divino jure* by the 'Universal College of Catholic Bishops,' and including within itself by their voluntary surrender all the non-episcopal churches, such a church would not continue united for a year. Can it, indeed, be truly said that there ever has been an united church on earth? In the remote past when, as we vainly suppose, cheated by the deluding distance, there was an 'undivided church,' so frequent were the disputes, and so obstinate the separations, that devout men regarded with fear the assembling of bishops as the certain presage of strife, and were tempted to look upon the episcopate, less as the pledge of harmony, than as the make-bate of Christianity. Throughout the Middle Ages such unity as existed was only secured by an elaborate and ubiquitous system of coercion; and, within the sphere of the Reformation, the national churches could only secure the semblance of unity by that practice of persecution which was their *damnosa hereditas* from the medieval past.

In the modern world such coercion is inconceivable; and, at the same time, the quickening of human intelligence and the enlargement of human knowledge have increased enormously

the probability of intellectual revolt. The Bishop of Zanzibar and his friends are pursuing a phantom, which is also an anachronism, when they seek the unity of the Church by an effort to resuscitate from the tomb of Time ideas, methods, and ideals which have for ever perished. Whatever unity is attainable by Christians must represent, not a return to what has been and is no more, but an advance towards what never has been yet, and which when it comes will imply a more sensitive respect for the individual conscience, and a higher standard of intellectual attainment, as well as a more effective organisation of the forces of a common Christianity. After all, if we follow Dr. Johnson's counsel, and 'clear our minds 'of cant,' there is nothing necessarily inconsistent with Christian unity in a variety of ecclesiastical systems, and it may well be the case that such a variety matches best the needs of a humanity which is almost infinitely various in type and circumstance. What *is* religiously hurtful, and deeply inconsistent with the principles of the Gospel, is the strife, mutual belittlement, competition, over-lapping, political intrigue, and the like, which have transformed a situation, not essentially wrong, into the intolerable scandal which now shocks all truly pious men in all the Churches. Not a successful diplomacy is needed, but a new spirit, in order that 'our 'unhappy divisions' should cease. When that new spirit of fraternity burns in Christian minds, the practical questions, such as those which engaged the thought of the missionaries at Kikuyu, will receive satisfactory answers. It is because the Conference at Kikuyu expressed that new spirit, that it has been generally hailed in this country with warm approval. It is because, where the spirit of Fraternity thus manifestly prevails among Christian men, their united reception of the Holy Communion appears so congruous as to be inevitable, that the action of the Bishop of Mombasa in communicating with the representatives of the other churches, though non-episcopal in their government, commands the general approbation of English churchmen.

H. Hensley Henson.

THE POSITION AND PROSPECTS OF BRITISH AGRICULTURE

1. **Agriculture and Live Stock Returns.** 1912. XLVII. Part I. Acreage and Live Stock Returns. Board of Agriculture. 1913.
2. **The Agricultural Output of Great Britain.** Report by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries in connection with the Census of Production Act of 1906. Board of Agriculture. 1912.
3. **English Farming Past and Present.** By R. E. PROTHERO. Longmans, Green and Co. 1912.
4. **A Pilgrimage of British Farming.** By A. D. HALL. John Murray. 1913.
5. **The Colonisation of Rural Britain.** By JESSE COLLINGS. Rural World Publishing Co. 1914.
6. **Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries to enquire . . . into Agricultural Education.** 1908.
7. **Annual Report on the Distribution of Grants for Agricultural Education and Research.** Board of Agriculture. 1914.
8. **Third Report of the Development Commissioners.** 1913.

TO anyone of middle age, whose acquaintance with agriculture goes back to his youth, the present public interest in the land must afford considerable matter for wonderment, so complete and so widespread has been the shift of opinion. A generation ago the country was sinking into the trough of the wave of agricultural depression, prices were still falling and farms being thrown back on to the owners' hands. Royal Commissions sat and reported on the disasters that were overtaking farming, but Parliament and the people at large were quite apathetic. So far as there was a defined opinion it was sharp and clear cut, to the effect that agriculture had ceased to be more than a side issue in an industrial community such as Great Britain had become. The country was to become the playground for the towns, where the rich man could have his hunting and shooting,

and the wage-earners their open commons and wild heaths. It is true that Mr. Jesse Collings had started the movement labelled ' Three acres and a cow,' and it is understood that the left wing of the Liberal party had considered the possibility of a land campaign such as we see to-day, but the irruption of Home Rule set all other questions aside and drove the reformers into the opposite camp. Discouragement, almost despair, was the note of the men themselves concerned with the land; owners lacked constructive leaders and were without a common policy, too often without a real appreciation of the changed situation. Among the cultivators a low level of intelligence prevailed; the fine farming methods that had been developed between 1840 and 1870 still were maintained, but had become a routine, something that appeared to the agricultural mind inevitable and necessary, to depart from which was almost immoral. Even agricultural science and education had reached a period of ebb. Lawes and Gilbert were old men with their great work behind them; Lawes could only counsel farmers and owners alike to reduce their expenditure—' high farming is no remedy for low prices,' and the few agricultural colleges that then existed were engaged in training agents rather than farmers.

The actual bottom level in prices was reached in 1894, when wheat had fallen to about 22*s.* per quarter; but by that time the farming community as a whole had learnt to adapt itself to the new conditions, the old-time men who farmed ' for ' pride ' had been shaken out, rents had been reduced, there had been a great conversion of arable into grass, Scotchmen had brought their cheaper methods south, and men knew how to make a living at the lower scale of prices. Landlords had often great tracts in hand, and few questions were asked as to the solvency or character of any tenant who proffered for a farm; but the bankruptcies were over and a stable condition of things seemed to be impending. It was during the late 'eighties and early 'nineties that many capable farmers in the Midlands and South of England acquired control of the great tracts of land they still hold; they had picked up the trick of cheap farming; they could make their own terms and even take land as a favour, until they were dealing with thousands instead of hundreds of acres by the simple process of skimming off what the land would yield with a minimum

outlay on labour and manure. But from the beginning of the present century a general prosperity has attended the industry, despite the vagaries of the last three seasons. Prices of agricultural produce have risen; wheat that had been 22*s.* has even touched 40*s.*, though 35*s.* may be taken as more the working average of late; barley, owing to the bad state of the brewing trade, has not risen so much, but wool and milk and meat have made notable advances that are reflected not merely in the average prices recorded but in the ease with which the farmer can dispose of his produce.

Now much of this increased return for his output has been sheer gain to the farmer who had learnt to keep afloat in the 'nineties. His rent has generally remained unchanged; labour has grown a little dearer, but has only risen markedly within the last twelve months; fertilisers have risen in price, and some feeding stuffs have advanced to such an extent as to modify the methods of farming; but with all these discounts the arable farmer has been able to make very substantial profits during the last ten years. No one who travels in the agricultural districts can doubt that the industry is in a sound and prosperous condition; farmers of course say as little as possible about their affairs, but they do not complain; agents get their rents, and farms of any quality are unobtainable; best index of all, the country tradesmen and the banks are quite satisfied with the situation. Of course in every part of the country there are still bad farmers, whose dirty fields and scanty crops are in marked contrast to those of their neighbours. Even when his methods of cultivation are respectable, the farmer is often a bad man of business, struggling ineffectively against a load of debt consequent on an initial lack of capital. In many districts, too, a serious proportion of the farmers are in the hands of some middleman, a corn and manure merchant or an auctioneer, through whom they have to conduct their buying and selling with the loss of the turn of the market every time, until in the worst cases they become little better than badly paid servants.

The most disquieting feature in the situation is the fact that the last decade of prosperity has not been attended by any substantial improvement in the productiveness of the land or in its utilisation for more intensive forms of agriculture. If we examine the Agricultural Statistics for England from

1870, the period of the highest prosperity, we find that, despite the depression, the extent of land under cultivation continued to rise slowly until 1891. Since that time rather more than half a million acres have been lost, a loss that can to some extent be accounted for by the growth of towns and residences.

Area under Cultivation, thousand acres.

	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910	1911	1912	1913
				ENGLAND				
Total .	23,409	24,596	25,008	24,714	24,515	24,478	24,414	24,375
Arable.	13,729	13,135	12,172	11,322	10,592	10,574	10,597	10,362
Per cent.	58·6	53·4	48·7	45·8	43·2	43·2	43·4	42·5
				SCOTLAND				
Total .	4,451	4,738	4,896	4,899	4,852	4,845	4,821	4,798
Arable	3,486	3,579	3,671	3,491	3,348	3,349	3,325	3,302

Live Stock, thousands.

				ENGLAND				
Cattle .	3,757	4,158	4,618	4,849	5,126	5,174	5,087	4,991
Sheep .	18,940	16,829	16,841	15,845	16,274	15,740	14,504	13,736
Pigs .	1,814	1,698	2,356	2,021	2,020	2,415	2,270	1,912
				SCOTLAND				
Cattle .	1,041	1,099	1,186	1,198	1,171	1,200	1,184	1,247
Sheep .	6,781	7,072	7,361	7,315	7,145	7,164	7,004	6,801
Pigs .	152	121	160	132	133	171	159	132

It is, however, clear that even the high prices of the last few years have not tempted men to bring under cultivation any appreciable fraction of the fringe of heath and waste and moor that borders the productive area, although in England there are about two and a half million acres returned as mountain and heath-land used for grazing. Another index of the progress of agriculture is afforded by the proportion the arable land bears to the permanent grass; and in this connexion we find that the actual acreage under the plough declined year by year from 1870 until 1912, when for the first time tillage regained a little ground, though the loss set in again in 1913. Relatively 58 per cent. of the cultivated area was tilled in 1870 as against 42 per cent. in the past year (1913).

The Scottish figures show the same characteristics; the area lost to cultivation has been somewhat greater, six hundred thousand acres since 1870, a loss not to be accounted for

by the land withdrawn for urban purposes, a loss also which is still operative, while the proportion under the plough has decreased from 78 per cent. in 1870 to 69 per cent. in 1913. The higher proportion of arable farming in Scotland is partly due to more intensive farming, partly to the fact that it is customary to leave the grass crop in the rotation down for a longer period; in Scotland the 'clover and rotation grasses' occupy about half the total arable acreage, whereas in England they constitute less than a quarter. Moreover, there is in Scotland a tendency to lengthen the duration of the temporary grass; formerly it used to stay down for two years in the five-year shift, latterly the duration has been extended to three years in six, and even in places to four years in seven.

The live-stock figures are even more disturbing. In England the change from arable to grass, from corn-growing to milk production, has naturally been reflected in an increase in the cattle, but the maximum was reached by about 1904–5; since then there have only been temporary fluctuations, though the continuous decline for the last three years in succession appears to be significant. Sheep, which in England are to a large extent associated with arable farming, have declined in numbers from 19 millions in 1870 to 14 millions at present; their number, however, has shown only temporary fluctuations from 1880 onwards, though the steady decline since 1910 is significant, the current figure being the lowest ever reached. Pigs are always variable, but the number now is much the same as it has been for the last forty years, though here again there was a serious decline in 1913. The Scottish returns are of much the same character.

It must be frankly confessed that the impressions of independent observers do not entirely agree with these statistics. Many careful observers can testify that both farming and farmers have improved during the last ten years in more than one important agricultural district in England and Scotland, and the more detailed statistics show an extension of certain forms of intensive cultivation, such as fruit and flower growing and the production of vegetables. Still, after making all allowances and qualifications, we cannot escape from the general conclusion that most of the signs of retrogression in agriculture—the diminished output, the conversion of arable into grass land, with its inevitable accompaniment of

a diminution in the number of live stock—that marked the great depression of a generation ago, have not only continued since prosperity returned to the industry, but have increased in intensity during the last three years. The conclusion is inevitable that the farmers of the country, taken as a whole, have not been tempted by the better prices they are receiving for their produce to farm higher and increase the output from their land; they have been content to pocket the larger profits rather than to seize the opportunity for an extended enterprise. To those who know the farmer this is not perhaps surprising; he is always inclined to farm by routine and tradition rather than on a plan revised to meet the current conditions; moreover, every year's work is somewhat of a gamble against the two uncontrollable factors, the weather and the markets. If an extra profit comes along, the farmer accepts it as a turn of the wheel in his favour, to set off against a bad year in the past; it takes a good many favourable years to give him that feeling of security which will lead him to change his methods in order to meet the new scale of prices. So many years are necessary to average the normal fluctuations of the seasons that farming must be conservative in its methods; to innovate is dangerous, and the farmer who is making his living by a particular style of business has considerable justification for sticking to it even when rising profits prompt him to greater enterprise. But that the continued rise of prices after a decade of reasonable prosperity has not led to a more widespread adoption of intensive methods during the last three years must be taken to indicate something more than the normal inertia of the farmer; it indicates a distrust in the stability of the situation which has kept him from putting his profits into increasing his business. Development, in fact, was bound to be slow and hesitating while the disasters wrought by the great depression were still fresh in men's memories; but the returning confidence that should be now in evidence has unquestionably been disturbed out of all reason by recent events like the small holdings movement, the sale of estates, and the land campaign. British agriculture is in need of more capital and fresh men, but just as it was becoming known that the conditions of the industry were again attractive, both tenants and owners of land have thought themselves threatened and have under political exploitation

become inordinately vocal about the difficulties in which they are being placed in dealing with the land. To sum up, we are faced by the disquieting fact that ten years or so of growing prosperity has not improved the mass of British farming, either in its methods or in its results; with a few exceptions the productivity of the land has not increased, but has rather declined.

Let us now examine the various proposals that have been made to remedy this state of affairs.

The proposal that seems to command the most support at the present time is to re-colonise the country with small holders, to get more men on to the land, and to use whatever pressure may be legitimate to split up the large farms employing labour into smaller units that can be worked by one man and his family. The present Government has passed the Small Holdings Act, with its powers for the compulsory acquisition of land, and that section of the party which chiefly interests itself in such questions is loud in its anxiety to speed up the process and force the local authorities charged with the administration of the Act into more drastic methods. The Unionist party equally accepts the small holdings policy, though it discerns a special virtue in creating small ownerships rather than small tenancies. Without doubt there is a real demand for small areas of land, a demand which became pressing a few years ago when farming generally began to pay once more. In some districts where a market gardening industry has become established, as in Bedfordshire and Worcestershire, the young men who are employed as labourers on existing holdings learn the business, save some money, and want to start for themselves. They and the grown-up sons of the present occupiers become eager competitors for whatever land can be detached from ordinary farming; the industry is prosperous, and as such men know the routine and the markets they can succeed, and they even extend further afield and carry their special trade into new districts. By competition amongst themselves they have forced up rents to a very high level in these particular districts, where, if anywhere, one can agree to the distinction which the Committee of the Land Inquiry wish to draw between competitive and fair rents. In addition, in every village and town there are a number of men already in some sort of employment who can make

profitable use of a piece of land not too far away. They may be small tradesmen who can sell part of their produce, men like blacksmiths and postmen with a certain amount of loose time, men who do a little carting or contracting, jobbing gardeners, odd men who see their way to working up a milk round, all sorts of rather independent and enterprising men who do not mind long hours at somewhat uneconomic rates if they can feel they are building up businesses of their own. The greater number of applications for small holdings come from men in purely urban employment, men who retain some country tastes and have been successful in keeping fowls or gardening under difficulties; men, again, who are in unwilling revolt against the whole industrial system, who would sell their tired souls to get out of a life of being ordered about, to be their own masters, and to do their own work, however long and heavy, in their own way. There are many others, too, a little above the labouring class, who have earned or succeeded to a few hundred pounds and have argued themselves on some theory of health or happiness into the belief that man finds his best scope in tilling the soil. These men have too often been the prey of sharping estate agents and land speculators, by whom they have been lured into impossible ventures on barren sands and stubborn clays, where the majority exchange their money for experience, while a few succeed beyond all reasonable expectations.

Unfortunately, the agricultural labourer proper has not been prominent in this demand for land; he has few illusions as to the profits derivable from farming; he has all too little spare energy for enterprise, or savings to give him the start; worst of all, he has grown to think of himself as tied to his class, a labourer once and for ever, not a potential master. Here and there, in districts where the farms are varied in size, the more energetic labourers, who become foremen and bailiffs early in life, look forward to making a start in a small way and gradually working on to the occupation of a larger holding, but these active young men are nowadays being more and more tempted away to Canada. Why should they live hard on small wages in England or Scotland in order to get the chance of becoming occupiers of twenty or thirty acres of indifferent land, when Canada is offering double or treble

the wages to start with, and a hundred and sixty acres free as soon as they are ready for them ?

The plain fact is that small holdings as such are as uneconomic as small shops or small factories ; when they are successful it is by virtue of the very special energy and business capacity of their holders, who soon exchange them for more extensive farms. The social value of small holdings is indisputable ; they must be regarded as necessary in the present organisation of the rural community ; but as a means of utilising either the man's labour or the land to the greatest advantage—of producing the maximum food for the people—they inevitably fail. A small holding is often supposed to mean more intensive farming, and this is true of the highly cultivated market gardens of Evesham or Biggleswade, when compared with the poorly farmed grass land that lies at no great distance from either. But such a comparison is misleading, because it is made between two distinct systems of agriculture—the old routine extensive farming and modern intensive cultivation. Within the limits of each system there are both large and small farms, and when the comparison is made between large and small of the same class the superiority is found to lie with the large occupier, whether we take profit or production per acre as the criterion. The grass-land farmer of fifty acres, who makes his living by selling milk, doing a little carting and raising a few calves and pigs, will be found to add less fertility to his land in the shape of manure or cake, to give less care to the management of his pastures and of his hedges, and to keep a poorer class of stock than his neighbour with four hundred acres. For such forms of extensive farming as the production of corn, meat, and wool, even the staunchest advocates of small holdings admit their inferior productiveness ; but they argue that in the production of milk and milk products and of fruit and other crops demanding a large labour outlay, the minute personal care which the small holder can give will more than balance his comparative lack of capital and opportunity for organisation.

But here, again, what are the facts ? Experience shows that the market gardener with fifty acres gets his work better executed than the man with five acres who does his cultivating himself ; that the man controlling a hundred acres of fruit cultivates, prunes, sprays, and generally manages his orchards

and plantations far more carefully and thoroughly than his neighbour who has to live on ten or fifteen acres. Again, the dairyman with forty or fifty cows in most cases turns out better and cleaner milk, prepared for market under far more sanitary conditions, than his indefatigable competitor who makes an arduous living out of three or four cows and a suburban milk round. It is impossible to find in this country a single branch of farming in which the smaller holder is not necessarily at a disadvantage as compared with the occupier of a larger acreage engaged in the same style of business. It is not only that the large farmer buys and sells better, for that could be remedied by co-operation; nor again that he can command implements and machinery which a small farm could not keep in sufficient use, for that drawback also could be overcome by co-operation; nor is it even the physical disadvantages of a small farm that chiefly count, as when a plough in a little field has to waste more time in turning; it is from his lack of enterprise and his unprogressiveness that the inevitable inferiority of the small holder comes. He can afford to lose but little, he always is living on a small margin, he must be conservative, he dare not experiment, he must keep closely to what he has learnt will pay in the accustomed way. The great advances which British agriculture made in the late eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century, advances which made our farming easily superior to that of other nations, such as the introduction of artificial fertilisers and concentrated feeding stuffs, and the invention of pedigree stock and corn, were rendered possible by the existence here of a race of large farmers with free capital; for they alone had the material upon which to work on a sufficiently large scale, and resources sufficient to enable them to wait until an enterprise matured.

If, then, we set aside the social advantages attaching to the existence of a certain proportion of small holdings, we must conclude that the small farm is economically inferior to the large one in virtue of its smallness; and that consequently the splitting up of our present holdings of 200–500 acres must result in diminished production, except in so far as the change is accompanied by an alteration in the style of cultivation from the extensive to the intensive. Without doubt this would take place to a certain extent. In all parts of the

country we find tenants content with a profit of 10s. to 20s. an acre upon their hundred to three hundred acres; but were their farms divided into ten or twenty-acre lots the new tenants would have to force the land to yield five times as much profit if they were to live at all. But, on the one hand, the existing tenant, given enterprise and capital, could with equal readiness and with greater profit raise the standard of his farming to that which would be forced on the small holder by the struggle for existence; while, on the other hand, there is a limit to the possible extension of intensive cultivation. The markets cannot absorb vegetables, fruit, and flowers in unlimited quantities, and really intensive cultivation only pays for these and similar high-priced products, not for corn and meat, wool and milk, which are still the mainstay of British farming. Nor can it be hoped that whole-hearted co-operation, aided by adequate technical instruction and supervision, will bind a community of small holders into a productive unit capable of trading on equal terms with the large capitalist farmers. Such an organisation is conceivable, but where do we see any signs of its coming into being? Any form, even the simplest, of productive co-operation is making the very slowest headway among small holders; the very spirit of self-reliance and individual enterprise that determines a man to take a little piece of land on his own, makes him at the same time indisposed to combine with his neighbours in a joint undertaking. The co-operative colony, much as it has been talked about, does not as yet exist. Moreover, co-operative organisation, education, and supervision cost money even as does the middleman, money that ultimately becomes a charge upon the industry, and which may easily constitute a bigger tax upon it than the profit exacted by the capitalist *entrepreneur*. If the State is to provide organisation and technical advice, will it not obtain a better response by applying them to a few large farmers than to many small ones? The value of co-operation to the farmer is indisputable, for through its action the middleman can be forced to content himself with payment for work done instead of taking the producer's profits; but it is futile to attempt to justify small holdings on the ground that co-operation will follow and bind these little undertakings into large productive units. Ideal for ideal, it would be better to

aim at big syndicate farms of ten thousand acres or more, farms which could be worked with true economy of well-paid labour, and which, like factories, would have employees of all grades between the 'hand' and the general manager, with prospects and opportunities of promotion for everyone. Farms on such a scale could really utilise modern science and modern machinery, and on them knowledge could be really converted into power in a way that is impossible on a small holding.

In this question of the relative advantages of large and small holdings, we cannot ignore the historical argument; the twentieth century, with its organised applications of science, may appear very different from the fourteenth, but the same causes are in operation, and the temperament of a people undergoes but little change through the centuries. From the earliest times the history of British agriculture has been full of laments for the displacement of the small farmer; the passages in More's 'Utopia' and in Latimer's sermon are familiar; less known are such quotations as Mr. Prothero has included in his recent book on English farming—the denunciation of the 'caterpillars of the common weal' who 'join 'lordship to lordship, manor to manor, farm to farm, land to 'land, pasture to pasture,' of those who make 'one fearme 'of two or three' and even sometimes 'bringe VI to one.' Later, Defoe's tour describes the number of small freeholders who still held their own, though Arthur Young laments that they had practically disappeared by his time. Coming down to our own time, the Board of Agriculture (Acreage and Live Stock Return 1911, Part I.) states that 'from 1895 to 1908 the 'loss of small holdings (from 5 to 50 acres) in England and 'Wales amounted to no less than 12,202,' and further estimates that the loss between 1890 and 1895 was 9912. More recently the passing of the Small Holdings and Allotments Act in 1907 began to operate and the number has risen, as is shown by the following figures for holdings of between 5 and 50 acres:

Number in England 1908	165,265
,, ,, ,, 1910	166,155
,, ,, ,, 1912	168,038

The gain, though substantial, is far from repairing the losses experienced during the period of depression, or even the fall in the shorter period from 1890 to 1895, and is, of course,

somewhat artificial in its origin. The Act has provided facilities and even applied external pressure towards the creation of small holdings, but facilities and pressure alike would have been unavailing had there not been an economic basis for the demand that has prevailed for such small farms. The clue both to the great diminution in the latter years of the nineteenth century and the recent recovery is to be found in the movement of prices. With falling prices the first men to suffer and lose their land are the small holders; their reserves are smaller, their adaptability to changed conditions is less, their mobility, in the sense that they can save a trifle from the wreck and get work of other kinds, is greater; at any rate we find that every recurring period of depression is attended by the loss of the yeomen farmers, whether owners or tenants. In some districts the face of the countryside was largely changed between 1880 and 1890. The reports of some of the sub-commissioners to the Royal Commission on Agricultural Depression contain ample evidence on this point. But with returning prosperity the first demand for land comes from the little men; they do not require much capital, their ears are nearest the ground, and they see at their doors how a living can be made long before the capitalist can satisfy himself that there is a safe opening for an investment. Even to-day there are few men with money coming into agriculture; the young Englishman who educates himself for farming is generally pressed by guardians and trustees to take his capital to Canada or Ceylon; the old wiseacres have still got their eyes fixed on the 'eighties, and reiterate with many instances that no gentleman can hope to farm without loss. So it comes about that the small men are the most eager to take advantage of the present possibility of making a profit out of the soil, just as again they will be the earliest to succumb when the inevitable wave of depression recurs.

There is, moreover, a larger reason for the mobility both of land and of landholders in this country. For many centuries now, but to an enormously increased extent during the last hundred and twenty years, farming in England has not stood alone, but has been in competition with commerce and industry for both men and capital. In countries like Germany, France, and Hungary, great tracts exist with no other outlet than

agriculture, where the whole fabric of society has to be supported by the land and the subsidiary industries it gives rise to; hence follows an exceptionally stable population and a very conservative system of farming. In England industrialism early invaded the countryside; land has been farmed, not as the sole means of subsistence, but as one way among others of obtaining a return upon capital, and men have gone in and out of agriculture as any other business. The yeoman has always been tempted by the never distant and continually expanding town; even when the father has stuck by the farm the son has tried his fortune in business or overseas, just as the young Scotch crofter is to-day being drawn to Canada. The comparative lack of progress exhibited by British farming during the last half-century may largely be set down to the competition of the industries for the brains of the country; the possibilities of getting rich by business have been so much greater that the best material among landlords, tenants, and labourers alike has been drawn away from rural life. This factor of industrial competition with agriculture must always exist, and more than anything else stands in the way of that re-colonisation of the land which so many men desire.

So far, then, from thinking that a general conversion of large into small holdings will increase the productivity of the land, it is more probable that there is some real connexion between the accelerated decline in the intensity of productivity during the last three years and the growth of small holdings during the same period.

The other method that has been suggested for the betterment of agricultural conditions is to give the tenant farmer security of tenure, so that he may be encouraged to improve his farm without fear of being rented upon his enterprise. This may seem an attractive proposition at the present time to tenants who took their farms during the 'nineties, and now see rents rising all round them, or estates sold in order to obtain the prevailing enhanced values for land without incurring the odium of putting up rents on sitting tenants. But at bottom Land Courts and other legislative means for conferring security of tenure are only steps in the process of transferring the ownership from the existing landlords to the occupiers, and must mean the end of the British rental system, in which

landlord and tenant are working partners, the landlord finding the permanent capital and meeting to some extent the fluctuations of the times by variations in rent. The real owner is the man who bears the brunt or reaps the benefit of those changes in the value of land which are brought about by outside forces such as world-wide movements in the prices of commodities. There is no reason in equity for handing over to the occupiers the rise in values that is now in sight, and were that to be done the occupier must also shoulder the risk of all future falls, for it would prove impossible to leave landlords liable to reductions in the rent, but never permitted to recoup themselves by corresponding increases when times improve. The land reformers presuppose a continuous rise in land values, and want to hand over such unearned increment to the present tenants. They have derived this opinion from a consideration of urban land in growing towns, yet the experience of the last thirty years alone ought to have shown them that agricultural land may shrink in value to less than the cost of the improvements alone that the owner has made. But, if there is to be an unearned increment, why should the tenant deserve it any more than the landlord? The only logical solution would be for the State to take over the land, bear itself the fluctuations in value, and allow farmer and labourer alike their living wage. Fortunately the nation is not prepared as yet for such socialisation of agriculture; and in the meantime this particular question whether effective ownership should be transferred to the present tenants or not is a matter of politics which does not bear upon the issue we are considering—the improvement in the productivity of the land.

British agriculture, admittedly the best in the world, has been built up on a rental system unknown in any other country. This at the outset is cogent evidence that the tenant has always possessed a working measure of security that has been sufficient to permit of the development of the industry. The yearly tenancy is an expression of the fact that landlord and tenant are essentially partners in British farming, and the terms of dissolution of partnership have been fixed with reasonable equity for all the ordinary methods of farming by the successive Agricultural Holdings Acts. It is the men following specialised forms of agriculture who are not properly protected by

the existing law—the pedigree-stock owners, the fruit and hop growers, the market gardeners, all risk the forfeiture of a good part of their capital. A man, for example, who plants fruit trees fixes indissolubly to the soil a good deal of capital for which he can obtain no immediate return ; should his tenancy be vacated for any reason he loses everything. Yet he cannot claim to draw his landlord into the speculation ; the fruit trees may not answer on that soil, and even if successful the owner may be indisposed to take over the adventure, because he has no certainty of finding tenants who will pay in extra rent a commercial interest on the cost of the improvement. In such cases the tenant must either take a lease and write off year by year the capital he cannot take away, or there must be a general adoption of the Evesham custom of free sale, under which the fruit trees or other improvements remain the property of the tenant, who has to find a successor willing to purchase them. Most landlords, however, are reluctant to part with the right of selecting their tenants, and the result is in practice that the tenant gets the land at a lower rent and takes the risk of either dying or being turned out before he has reaped the full advantage of the business he builds up on another man's property. As it is desirable to encourage such farmers as have enterprise enough to take risks and try intensive forms of cultivation that are not contemplated in the ordinary agreements, there is perhaps a theoretical case for giving such men whatever security of tenure may be derived from an appeal to a Land Court. Actually, however, instances of this kind are not numerous, and it is a question of expediency whether it is wise to attempt to remedy these occasional injustices by the creation of an institution liable to all the abuses and dangers that are known to attend a Land Court.

A Land Court is a mechanism, as one of its supporters described it, 'to steam-roller rents,' and Irish experience shows that it tempts the tenant not only to farm badly to keep his own rent down, but also to put pressure on his neighbours to make as bad a showing as possible. A landlord on the spot should know enough about the state of agriculture to estimate the rent a tenant ought to be able to pay, and can insist on a certain standard of cultivation ; a Land Court has to decide on the case stated before it, i.e. on the tenant's

showing of poverty. Security of tenure means in practice that current rents, or something lower, are to be crystallised; yet it is arguable that, if the productivity of our land is to be raised to its proper level, rents ought to be increased in order to force the farmer to get more out of the land. As pointed out above, the tenant has pocketed the advantages derived from the recent rise of prices without improving his farming, preferring—such indeed is the natural inertia of human beings—to sit on his profits. Again it will be found that farming is best where the rents are highest, in the Lothians, on the Ayrshire coast, or the alluvial lands of South Lincoln and Cambridgeshire. Other land of equal quality may be instanced where rents are less and farming at a lower level. More than a century ago Arthur Young argued to the same effect:

> 'Of so little encouragement to them is the lowness of their rents that many large tracts of land that yielded good crops of corn within thirty years are now overrun with whins, brakes, and other trumpery. If it be demanded how such ill courses are to be stopped, I answer, Raise their rents. First with moderation, and if that does not bring forth industry, double them.'

But the main argument against conferring entire security of tenure upon existing tenants is that it is bad policy for the State to raise a barrier against the new men who want to take up agriculture, and are prepared to pay higher rents and to farm better in order to do so. Even as it is, farming is far too much treated as a matter of routine handed down from father to son; to extend such a custom and form a sort of hereditary cultivator caste would well-nigh put an end to progress in agriculture and make developments in the light of science even more rare than they are now. All experience shows that as long as men can live on the land in the style to which they have been accustomed, however mean that standard may be, they will rest content and forgo the possible profits that greater enterprise and new methods would open to them. The seaboard of North Wales affords a notable example of backward farming and unused opportunities of soil, climate, and markets; yet there the farms are small, new tenancies and ownerships rare, farming an hereditary occupation. Economic pressure and commercial competition afford a great stimulus to good work: to remove part of this

pressure by securing to the existing race of tenants the continued possession of their farms must tend to defer rather than promote intensive cultivation and the more effective utilisation of the land.

The first and only method of securing better farming is to create better farmers; instead of crystallising and making irremovable the indifferent farmers of to-day we want to replace them by more enlightened men, and this we cannot do as yet because a sufficiency of the more enlightened race does not exist. This is the point the land reformers so often appear to forget. Farming and farmers are susceptible of enormous improvement, but are what they are in virtue of the quality of the men engaged in the business. Moreover, these imperfect agents are the only ones available, for we have no reason to suppose that there exists in the country a large body of capable farmers now only lacking opportunities for the exercise of their craft. There is plenty of bad farming, as of bad shopkeeping, and the cause is alike in both cases—the stupidity and ignorance of many of the men engaged in the business.

We are thus driven back to the tedious conclusion that the only method of securing the permanent improvement of the agricultural situation is to ameliorate the farmer, existing and prospective, by extending his knowledge and increasing his capacity. Education for both master and man remains the one sure means of uplifting the whole fabric of the industry, on whatever system of tenure or size of holding it may be practised, and a duly educated community would without doubt soon settle for itself what systems of tenure and sizes of holding were best suited for the development of different branches of the industry in different parts of the country. It is easy to object to education that the most prosperous farmer in a given district may be barely able to sign his own name; personal success is due to character and will-power; differences between one man's performance and another's will always exist, but education determines the general level of the industry above or below which the individual still continues to work according to his personality.

By education here is meant not merely the opportunities for actual technical instruction but our national attitude

towards knowledge and research. Indeed the most hopeful sign of the present situation is the change that within the last quarter of a century has come over the farmers and the farmers' organisations in their views about education. Prior to 1888 agricultural education and research received no official recognition in Great Britain; a few privately owned colleges gave comparatively expensive courses of instruction; a Professor of Agriculture lectured at the University of Edinburgh, while Lawes and Gilbert at Rothamsted represented practically the whole of our contribution to the science of agriculture. In that year the Treasury placed an annual sum of £5000 at the disposal of the Agricultural Department of the Privy Council (afterwards the Board of Agriculture) for the purpose of aiding agricultural and dairy schools, but the real step forward came with the handing over in 1890 of the residue grant (the so-called 'whisky money') to County Councils for purposes of technical instruction. The immediate result was the foundation of a number of agricultural colleges, departments, and schools of divers types—Cambridge, Wye, Leeds, for example—most of which have persisted and grown until they form the foundations of the system existing to-day. Mainly to the efforts of these pioneer institutions may be attributed the change which has come over not only agricultural but general public opinion. The men working in these centres have convinced, in the first place their neighbours, and then the country at large, of the value of knowledge and investigation. The County Councils were, however, as regards education, a law unto themselves, and the intensity with which they pursued agricultural education depended as a rule upon their wealth and not upon their need for such instruction; rich and suburban Surrey would found a college while purely agricultural Lincoln devoted its grant to the relief of rates. In consequence the whole system hung patched and scrappy, and it has only been the advent of fresh supplies from the Development Fund that has quite recently enabled the Board of Agriculture to exercise any general co-ordinating power and lay the foundations of a scheme that shall provide for all the needs of the agricultural community. The scheme does now, however, exist in outline; time and the co-operation of the local authorities, above all the willingness of the people themselves to be educated, are necessary to fill it in and make

it a real factor in the national prosperity. As the successive stages in the enterprise have followed one another somewhat rapidly in White Papers, regulations of the Board of Agriculture, reports of the Development Commissioners, etc., it may not be out of place to summarise what has been accomplished and what is now possible in the way of rural education.

Beginning at the top, there must be research, a fountain of knowledge to keep instruction living and progressive, and accordingly some ten or a dozen 'Institutes' have been founded and as a rule attached to some University, for the purpose of investigation alone. For example, at Cambridge there is one Institute studying the nutrition of animals, a subject also pursued in concert at Leeds and Aberdeen. At Cambridge too the breeding of new varieties of crops is attacked systematically. At Rothamsted the Experimental Station has been raised to a higher power to deal with soil problems; at Kew plant diseases are investigated; while provision is being made in London for dealing with the important question of animal diseases. These Research Institutes are non-local and are not expected to communicate their results directly to the farmer. Parallel to and independent of them comes the educational organisation. For purposes of higher agricultural education, England and Wales are divided into twelve provinces, in each of which is situated an agricultural college giving long courses of instruction suitable for the sons of landowners and of larger farmers, land agents, teachers, and other officials. The colleges are maintained by grants from the County Councils under the Technical Instruction Act and contributions from the Board of Agriculture. They are further charged with the duty of providing technical advice on such matters as soils and manures, diseases of plants, etc., for the farmers resident within their province, and to enable them to carry out this latter work they receive annual grants from the Development Fund of £1000 each, in order to pay two or three men who are exempt from teaching and have all their time free for local investigation and inquiry. Each college has also been provided with a live-stock officer, who has charge in his province of the administration of the scheme for the improvement of live stock, towards which the Board of Agriculture will make considerable grants from the Development Fund. His duties consist in organising suitable

societies, controlling the subsidised sires, and generally in giving advice as to the breeding and management of live stock.

The needs of the larger farmers of the country are thus not inadequately provided for, but it is less easy to get at the small farmer who cannot afford to send his son, even with a scholarship, to the agricultural college, nor to put him afterwards in a position to utilise the type of instruction there given. A scheme, however, has been prepared whereby each county will receive considerable grants in order to set up a Farm Institute providing short courses of instruction of a practical nature, and also acting as a centre for instructors who will traverse the county, giving lectures and advice and carrying out experiments with crops and stock to demonstrate improved methods of farming. The ideal aimed at is to bring the young farmer to the Institute for ten or twelve weeks in the winter when work upon the farm is slack, each course being complete in itself, though the student should come for two or three courses in successive years in order to range over the whole subject. To minimise the difficulties created by the fact that the county is the educational unit, counties are encouraged to combine in the provision of various types of Institutes and the exchange of students, and Provincial Councils have been set up consisting of representatives of the County Councils within the area, of the College and other agricultural organisations, with the view of securing concerted action and a systematic review of the needs of the district. Though the Development Fund will provide from one half to three quarters of the cost of such Institute work, only slow progress must be expected, because of the heavy demands on the rates for primary education; but as the scheme comes into operation the small farmer will be able to get his son trained in improved methods of cropping, in the management of live stock, in the economical use of manures and feeding stuffs, etc., without losing his assistance upon the farm.

The most notable deficiency in rural education comes a stage lower, in the gap that exists between the primary school and the Institute, a discontinuity that in the majority of cases is final, and permanently cuts off the young countryman from all contact with learning. Many observers have reported that the boys in the rural primary schools are possessed of

more than average intelligence, yet within a few years of leaving school they as a rule acquire an uncouthness and impenetrability that makes them a class apart, with their own customs and code of honour, recognising only compulsory obligations to the rest of the community, whose thoughts and interests they make no claim to share. Later in life, perhaps, their intelligence may again develop under the stimulus of practical affairs, and there grows up the shrewd old countryman of whom everyone can recall one or two shining examples. The evil is wrought in those early years just after leaving school, when the boy is set to long hours of unintelligent routine work, when no stimulus reaches his mind, and only his growing appetites remind him that he is a man. It is the monotony that kills the intelligence, and in many districts farmers have acted with great unwisdom in trying deliberately to shut down young men's initiative and to reduce them to 'hands' rather than human beings. In some parts the labourers are not allowed to keep chickens or pigs, lest they should be tempted to steal corn; in others their attempts to learn the finer arts of the labourer, like land draining or measuring, are frowned upon because it might make them think they knew as much as their masters. With such factors at work above and below—masters striving to keep men from getting uppish, men inclined to find safety and wisdom in the maxim that such things are not for the likes of them—small wonder that a servile and stupid race grows up. Those men to whom a little energy or enterprise is left go to the Colonies, for the emigration agents are busy in all the villages and know both how to pick and how to persuade. The nation cannot afford to allow this waste of intelligence to proceed; the farmer himself will be the first to feel the need of brains in his labourers as the scarcity of them becomes acute, and their consequent higher price has to be compensated for by a more skilful utilisation of their powers. What is necessary is to make the continuation school a reality in every village. In a few instances such schools exist, and the Board of Education has drawn up syllabuses and regulations that are reasonable enough, but scholars cannot be compelled to attend, and the local authorities are adverse to the expense of organising them properly. The establishment of such schools must be attended by some considerable expense, for

teachers who are engaged all day in their present duties cannot attack a further instalment of evening instruction with the freshness that is essential for classes of boys and girls who have begun their work in the world. The teaching should be unconventional and stimulating, some of it may be real—dealing with plants and animals—but no formal instruction in agriculture is desirable; what is needed is to keep the pupil's intelligence active and awake to the existence of a world outside his own immediate experience. Until continuation schools, both in town and country, are part of the normal educational fabric we shall fail to reap any adequate return for our expenditure on primary schools, and agriculture in particular will continue to be starved of the intelligence that lies dormant in the labouring classes.

It may seem but a lame conclusion that we can discern no ready road to the reform of agriculture, nothing but the slow and uphill path of ameliorating the intelligence of the men and women engaged in the industry. But farming is a business like any other, competing with other businesses for brains and capital, progressing and declining through the operation of economic factors that are difficult to diagnose, and still more difficult, even dangerous, to deal with legislatively. In Great Britain there are good and bad farms just as there are good and bad boot factories, good and bad lawyers' offices. In one mood we may deplore the extinction of the retail trader by the great stores, in another mood we may be roused to anger by the waste of energy and deplorable lack of intelligence displayed in a mean street of suburban shops; but we are not prepared either, on the one hand, to sweep up the little shops into great emporiums or to divide Harrods up into sections suitable for letting to the residents in the back streets of Pimlico or Chelsea. Let us deal with agriculture like any other industry, and above all strive to make it offer a career for which young men will train themselves seriously. When we have enough good farmers to use the land of Great Britain to the best advantage, we may begin to dispute how it may most advantageously be divided up; meantime we shall be quite safe in concentrating our efforts on raising all our cultivators to the level of the more enlightened among them.

THE OXFORD DICTIONARY

A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles; founded mainly on the materials collected by the Philological Society. Edited by Sir James A. H. Murray, with the assistance of many scholars and men of science. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1884–1914 (in progress).

IT is now thirty years since the first instalment appeared of this gigantic work, which, when finished, will form the most complete Thesaurus of the English language in existence and, indeed, the greatest dictionary of any language. It is more comprehensive than the admirable 'Deutsches Wörter-'buch' of Grimm, the model of all later historical dictionaries, which began to appear in 1854 and, though already numbering thirteen volumes, is yet unfinished; it is far more voluminous than the great 'Dictionnaire de la Langue Française' of Littré, published in four volumes between 1863 and 1872, with a supplementary volume dated 1878; and it is wider in its scope than either of them. For while Littré's French Dictionary commences only with the seventeenth century, and Grimm's German Dictionary goes back no farther than the middle of the fifteenth century, the plan of the 'New English Dictionary' covers the whole extent of the Middle and New English periods, from 1150 down to the present day. Any word which at any time belonged to the standard English vocabulary during these eight centuries is catalogued and discussed as to its historical development, no matter whether it is to-day living or obsolete. Thus the period of time embraced by the 'New 'English Dictionary' begins three centuries before Grimm's starting-point, and five centuries before that of Littré. Moreover, though the 'New English Dictionary' excludes words which became obsolete during the Anglo-Saxon period, yet the history of every word admitted into the Dictionary is given from its very first appearance in literature, and the possible changes of form and meaning a word may have undergone during the Anglo-Saxon period are dealt with no less thoroughly than those which it experienced in later times.

And while Grimm's Dictionary, especially in its earlier volumes, excludes many loanwords from foreign languages, although they may have become part and parcel of the German language, the 'New English Dictionary' draws the line much more liberally; all words that really belong to standard English speech are admitted into its columns, no puristic distinction being made between the vernacular and the borrowed element. If a word is rejected from the Dictionary it must be either because it is purely a dialect word and never used in literature at all, or purely foreign and only used by English writers as a quotation.

It is obvious that a work planned on such an enormous scale could not be undertaken without extraordinary preparations, nor carried out by a single individual. In point of fact no less than twenty-six years elapsed between the earliest gathering of materials and the publication of the first instalment of the Dictionary. The material which forms the basis of the whole work was collected by hundreds of readers; and though the definite shaping and making of the Dictionary is due to the ceaseless energy of one man, he has now for many years been assisted in his editorial work by two co-editors and a numerous staff of assistants.

It was in 1857 that the Philological Society, at the suggestion of the late Archbishop Trench, resolved 'that materials should 'be collected for a Dictionary which, by the completeness of its 'vocabulary, and by the application of the historical method 'to the life and use of words, might be worthy of the English 'language and of English scholarship.' For this purpose, illustrative quotations were to be extracted from all writers before the sixteenth century, and from as many as possible of the more important writers of later times. In 1858 the collection of materials began. Several hundred readers in the United Kingdom, in the British Colonies, in the United States, in fact all over the world, set to work, under the general editorship of Herbert Coleridge, and collected quotations from English writers of all ages, while a staff of competent scholars undertook to arrange the materials thus amassed. The first chief editor, Herbert Coleridge, died while preparing for the press some specimens showing the lines which he proposed to follow in dealing with the words. He was succeeded by *Frederick J. Furnivall*, who had already acted as sub-editor.

The process of collecting material went on for years and years; it took much more time and caused more trouble than had been anticipated at the outset. Slips were returned to Furnivall from all parts of the world, until more than two millions of quotations were collected. But though portions of this enormous material were roughly arranged and prepared for later use, the actual compilation of the Dictionary was as far off as ever, and the project seemed in danger of abandonment.

This was the state of things when a firm hand laid hold of the scheme and undertook the superintendence of the work.

In 1876, Messrs. Harper, the American publishers, communicated with Messrs. Macmillan concerning the plan of an 'International Dictionary' which was to compete with Webster's well-known work, and the latter firm asked Dr. Richard Morris, the philologist, if he could recommend a competent editor. Morris proposed *Dr. James A. H. Murray*, a Scottish scholar, and member of the Philological Society.

Born in 1837 at Denholm, near Hawick, Roxburghshire, and since 1870 a master at Mill Hill School, Dr. Murray had, besides various papers in the Transactions of the Philological Society, published a book on 'The Dialect of the Southern 'Counties of Scotland' (1873), had edited 'The Romance and 'Prophecies of Thomas of Erceldoune' (1875), and other works, for the Early English Text Society, and had written the article 'English Language' in the 'Encyclopædia 'Britannica.' He declared his willingness to undertake the task, but only if the work in question were to be bigger than Webster. When Messrs. Macmillan replied with an inquiry as to the existence of materials for a great historical dictionary, Dr. Murray told them all he knew about it. He then at their request wrote some specimen articles with the help of the materials of the Philological Society which Furnivall kindly put at his disposal. Thereupon Macmillans made Harpers a proposal for the joint publication of a big dictionary, according to the scheme laid down by Dr. Murray. But Harpers wanted the book to be smaller than Webster; so the negotiations fell through.

Dr. Murray now showed the specimen articles he had written to several members of the Philological Society, and, having

secured their approval, proceeded to approach various publishers with regard to the production of an historical English Dictionary; but all declined. Meanwhile Professor Max Müller and Dean Liddell, of Christ Church, had become interested in the matter, and with their help and recommendation the Council of the Philological Society laid the scheme before the Oxford University Press. Many of the Delegates at first were against it; they wanted an Oxford man to do the work. But Dr. Murray was requested to hand in further specimen articles, and after these had been examined Professor Price, the Secretary to the Delegates of the Oxford Press, informed Dr. Murray that the meeting of the Delegates had resolved to undertake the publication of the Dictionary, upon condition that Dr. Murray would do the editing. He added: 'You 'had better consider the matter carefully; for if you do 'the editing the work will be done; if not, it will not be 'done.' A fortnight of serious doubt and hesitation ensued for Dr. Murray. The Governors of Mill Hill School liberally declared their willingness to release him from one third or one half of his school work. But he knew that the task he was about to take upon himself would bind him for his whole lifetime. He had a family to provide for, and would have to resign the certain prospect of a well-endowed headmastership he had in view. After much consideration and much fear and trembling he decided to undertake the task, a decision in which he was heartily backed and encouraged by his wife.

So in December 1878 the contract with the Oxford University Press was made, by which the Delegates agreed to bear the expense of printing and publishing a dictionary to be founded on the materials collected by the Philological Society. In the spring of 1879 Dr. Murray left Mill Hill School and started work as editor of the new Dictionary. Furnivall sent out a circular to all the old readers, asking if they were willing to continue their co-operation under the new editor. Nine-tenths continued to read, one of whom, a schoolmaster at Kendal, is still a contributor. But when the quotations collected by the former readers were arranged alphabetically and carefully examined, it was seen that a good deal of work still remained to be done before the final editorial business could begin. Furnivall thought that at least another million quotations were wanted. So a new appeal was made to

the public at large to help in collecting further quotations from specified books, and new regulations for the readers were drawn up. More than 800 readers declared their willingness to co-operate.

Materials now came streaming in from all sides. Thousands and thousands of slips were returned, but few of the contributors had done anything in the way of arranging and sub-editing. When Dr. Murray saw the enormous mass increasing daily, he soon found himself face to face with the serious question where to store and keep it. He thought for a moment of the possibility of turning his drawing-room into a warehouse for the Dictionary—a suggestion to which Mrs. Murray very naturally objected. At last, an iron room was constructed in the garden—the famous Scriptorium in which the first parts of the Dictionary were compiled.

The editor's further path to success was not without grave disappointments and personal privations.

One of his first assistants, a man of decided ability, but with a perfect lack of moral sense, stole his books and sold them, opened the packages sent in by the readers, used the material at his disposal in order to contribute to another dictionary, and, while drawing his assistant's salary, received payment from his other employers as well.

Yet, in spite of this and other unpleasant experiences, Murray unswervingly went on with his work, effectively aided by his army of readers and his general staff of sub-editors. In the course of three years a million additional quotations were furnished, raising the total number to about three and a half millions, collected by about 1300 readers, from works by over 5000 writers of all periods of English literature. The quotations were arranged, and definitions of the various meanings of the words were prepared, by a staff of about thirty voluntary sub-editors.

The general plan of the Dictionary was considerably changed by the new chief editor from the model first set up by the Philological Society. Originally two dictionaries were proposed: one of ordinary educated English speech, and one of technical expressions. But on commencing to work out his articles for the Dictionary in detail Murray soon saw that, while it was easy, in a great many cases, to detach certain words as mere technical terms for the Technical Dictionary,

in other cases many words of common educated speech had technical senses beside their ordinary ones, and it proved extremely difficult to separate the technical shade of meaning from the others; while to ignore the technical meaning altogether in the ordinary Dictionary would render this defective. Dr. Murray, therefore, determined to make one dictionary only which should contain all the words.

At the end of three years he was able to begin to print, and after five years' continuous labour the first instalment of the Dictionary was published, in January 1884, under the title: 'A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles; 'founded mainly on the materials collected by the Philological 'Society.' The next parts were issued in rapid succession, and the first volume, containing the letters A and B, was completed in 1888.

In 1885 Murray moved to Oxford and re-erected the Scriptorium there. After he had finished the letter B he thought it advisable, in the interests of a speedier progress of the work, to appoint an associate. He selected *Henry Bradley* for this post, a scholar eight years his junior (born in Manchester, in 1845), who had written some able reviews of the Dictionary for the 'Academy.' This was in 1889. The choice could not have been more fortunate. Bradley was a self-trained philologist. After having, in early life, been engaged in private teaching, he was employed as a commercial clerk and foreign correspondent at Sheffield till 1884, when he removed to London and became a contributor to the 'Academy,' 'Athenaeum,' and other periodicals, and temporary editor of the 'Academy' in 1884–85. In 1888 he published a fascinating book on the Goths in 'The Story 'of the Nations.' His interest had early turned to the study of philology, and his reviews in the 'Academy' showed that he was fully abreast of the latest results of philological research and well versed in etymology. He was at the time engaged upon a new and revised edition of Stratmann's 'Middle 'English Dictionary,' which he published shortly afterwards, in 1891. Henry Bradley soon became a strong pillar of the Dictionary; his contributions to it are marked by thoroughness, acuteness, and ingenuity. Besides his work on the Dictionary, he has found time to publish quite a number of valuable contributions to English philology. Though leading

the retired life of a scholar, he has not lacked public recognition. He was three times elected President of the Philological Society, and in 1903 the title of Doctor of Philosophy *honoris causa* was conferred upon him by the University of Heidelberg.

In 1901 a third joint-editor was added in the person of *Mr.* (now Dr.) *William A. Craigie* (born at Dundee in 1867), who had been engaged on the Dictionary since 1897, and who brought with him a reputation as an authority on Scandinavian languages. He had written various articles on Scottish and Scandinavian subjects in several learned periodicals, and published editions of Burns. He still continues to work on Scandinavian philology alongside of his editorial duties.

Dr. Murray himself was knighted in 1908. The sixth volume, completed in that year, ' is a memorial of the muni-' ficence of the Worshipful Company of Goldsmiths,' who generously contributed £5000 towards its production. So much for the outward history of the Dictionary and its editors.

The great work was now before the public, and everybody could form a judgment as to its merits or possible defects. That a dictionary of such colossal dimensions cannot be perfect in every detail need not be pointed out ; but as to the plan and the general features of the ' New English Dic-' tionary,' there was and can be only one voice of unanimous recognition and thankful admiration. It left all existing dictionaries far behind, not only in the number of words included, but also in the historical, analytical, and descriptive work of the editors, and in excellence of typographical arrangement.

The aim of the ' New English Dictionary ' is to furnish a clear and reliable statement of the origin, history, and meanings of all ' English words now in general use, or known ' to have been in use ' during the last eight centuries. It includes all the common words in use in the spoken language and in literature ; it further includes all scientific and technical terms so long as they are English in form. Slang and cant words, on the other hand, and all those scientific and technical expressions, not English in form, which are not in general use, are excluded from the pages of the Dictionary. As for dialect words, all those occurring in Middle English, down to the end of the fifteenth century, are indiscriminately

admitted, because during this period the language existed only in dialects; but all dialect words and forms which do not occur till after 1500 are excluded, 'except when they continue 'the history of a word or sense once in general use,' but now obsolete in common speech, or when they serve to 'illustrate 'the history of a literary word,' or have partly been adopted into the literary vocabulary, like many Scottish words. It is, of course, impossible for the lexicographer to be absolutely consistent in the selection and admission of words, as the lines between the different word-categories are indefinite and wavering; but Dr. Murray was certainly right in deciding to draw the line for admission as widely as possible.

The catchwords are given under their 'modern current 'or most usual spelling, or, if obsolete, under the most typical 'of their latest spellings.' But in many cases the orthography of a word, though used in modern literature, is still unsettled. This is especially the case with archaic words employed as technical terms in historical or antiquarian treatises, or artificially revived by modern authors in ballads, historical novels, and the like, where the spelling varies in correspondence with the wavering medieval writings, before orthography was fixed by the introduction of printing, e.g.: *arbalest : arblast ; baldric : baudrick ; baudekin : bawdkin*, etc. It is similar with dialect words appearing in general literature. As dialects have no settled orthography, these words occur in diverse forms in the written language; cp. *bigg : big*, 'four-rowed 'barley'; *bogie : bogy : bogey*, etc. Diversity of spelling is more common still in loanwords from foreign languages, especially those which do not use the Roman alphabet and have sounds unfamiliar to the English tongue, which are phonetically represented in different ways, like *assagai : assegai : assegay ; baksheesh : bakshish ; Bengali : Bengalee ; bungalow : bungalo : bungallow*, etc. But there are also a great many perfectly naturalised or genuine English words in which the orthography, for one reason or other, is still unsettled; for instance, *aerie : aery : eyrie ; ay : aye ; balk : baulk ; bourn : bourne ; brier : briar ; gray : grey ; judgement : judgment.*

In all these cases it was, of course, the lexicographer's duty to register the various ways of writing as shown by quotations. At the same time, since each word can naturally be treated only in one place in the Dictionary, a selection

had to be made among the different spellings. In making this choice, the preponderance of modern usage was decisive, whenever this was clearly marked; but in cases where usage was more or less equally divided, etymological or phonetic considerations, or analogy with similar words, or merely practical convenience, served as criteria to determine the spelling adopted in the Dictionary. Thus, while in modern usage words like *baptize, criticize, hypnotize, recognize, stigmatize*, etc. are written either *-ise* or *-ize*, in the Oxford Dictionary the termination, whenever it represents the Greek *-ίζειν* late Latin *-izare*, is, on etymological and on phonetic grounds, uniformly spelled *-ize*, to the exclusion of *-ise*, which is only the French spelling of the same Greek ending.

Sometimes it proved extremely difficult to arrive at a definite decision as regards the spelling to be adopted. In the case of *grey : gray* the test of etymology and analogy only increases the dilemma. The adjective goes back to Old English *grǣg*, which has few analogues; of these, *clǣg* is now written *clay*, while *hwǣg* has become *whey*. *Key*, the modern form of *cǣg*, is irrelevant on account of its pronunciation. Of Old English words ending in *-ǣge, blǣge*, a 'gudgeon,' is in its modern form spelled either *blay* or *bley*; *fǣge*, 'doomed 'to death,' is *fey*; *wǣge*, 'scales, balance,' *wey*. So the majority are written with *-ey*, but most of them are extremely rare or obsolete, while *clay* is the only one in general use. As regards the modern usage in writing the word *gray* or *grey*, Dr. Johnson and later lexicographers preferred *gray*. An inquiry made by Dr. Murray in 1893 led to interesting results. From the numerous replies returned it appeared that in Great Britain the form *grey* is more commonly used. The printers of 'The Times,' it is true, stated that they always wrote *gray*, while other great printing firms preferred *grey* or had no fixed rule. In two phrases, *the Scots Greys* and *a pair of greys*, the word is almost universally written with *e*. Many correspondents, especially artists, replied that they used the two forms with a slightly differing meaning, *grey* denoting 'a more delicate or lighter 'tint than gray'; others felt 'that gray is a "warmer" 'colour, or that it has a mixture of red or brown'! This is, of course, nonsense, but it shows to what preposterous consequences the differentiation in orthography can lead people. The 'New English Dictionary' had to choose one

of the two spellings, and the editor decided in favour of *grey*, but the form *gray* is given as an alternative.

In the vast majority of words, of course, the orthography is now fixed. But it was greatly different, say, in the time of Shakespeare, when people were not even consistent in the writing of personal names, and it was worse still in Middle English times before the introduction of printing. The 'Oxford Dictionary' gives under every word a concise history of its spelling in former centuries, based on quotations in which the original orthography is most carefully preserved. In many cases these differences of spelling are only graphic variants, but frequently they give a valuable clue to the history of the pronunciation of a word.

Debt and *doubt* were written *dette*, *det*, and *doute*, *dout*, down to the sixteenth century, being adaptations from Old French *dette* (vulgar Latin *dēbita*, Latin *dēbitum*) and *dute*, *doute* subst., *duter*, *douter* verb (Latin *dubitare*). Owing to the influence of the Latin originals, the French words were, from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries, sometimes artificially spelt *debte*, *doubter*, from which *debt* and *doubt* became the standard English spelling in the sixteenth century, while in French the *b* was again abandoned. The *b* in the two English words, therefore, has never been pronounced, and owes its existence merely to an erroneous etymological derivation from the Latin words, with which they have no direct connexion.

Similarly the *l* in *could* has never been pronounced; it was *koude* (earlier *kouthe*) in Middle English, *cūþe* in Anglo-Saxon. The *l* is due to the analogy of *should* and *would*, where it is etymologically correct; cf. Middle English *sholde*, *wolde*, Anglo-Saxon *scolde*, *wolde*.

The *-d* in *sound*, 'a noise,' is accrescent: it was added in the sixteenth century. The Middle English form was *sūn*, *soun*, from Anglo-Norman *soun*, French *son* (Latin *sonus*).

Delight, adapted from Old French *delit*, verb *delitier* (Latin *delectare*), was written *delit*, *delyt* from Middle English times till late in the sixteenth century, when it was supplanted by the present form, an erroneous spelling based upon false analogy with *light*, *night*, *flight*, etc.

Victuals looks as if it were derived from Latin *victuālia*, but it has never been pronounced as it is spelt: the modern pronunciation *vit'lz* is the correct continuation of the Middle

English form *vitaille* found in Chaucer, from Old Frēnch *vitaille*, representing a vulgar Latin *vitālia* (not *victuālia*, as Skeat in his 'Etymological Dictionary' states). But a spelling *victuaille*, due to wrong etymology, also occurs in later Old French and was probably the model of the modern English form (as in the case of *debt* and *doubt* above mentioned).

In numerous examples the orthography has actually influenced the pronunciation. Middle English *parfet*, *parfit*, from Old French *parfait*, *parfit*, Latin *perfectum*, was supplanted, in the sixteenth century, by the learned spelling *perfect*, which gradually altered the pronunciation, though even in the eighteenth century two grammarians pronounce the word without *k*. It is similar with Modern English *verdict*, from Middle English *verdit*, Old French *verdit*, Latin *vere dictum*, and *subject*, from Middle English *suget*, *subget*, French *sujet*.

The Middle English form of *fault* is *faute*, from French *faute*, vulgar Latin *fallita*, past participle of *fallere*. In French *faute* the etymological *l* was inserted by some writers of the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries, and this was imitated in English, where the first instance is in the manuscripts of Barbour written in 1487–89. Bullokar, as early as 1580, records the pronunciation with audible *l*, which Gill, in 1621, recommends as the pronunciation of learned society in opposition to the more frequent, common pronunciation without *l*. From the seventeenth century *fault* has been the standard spelling, but in so frequent a word the learned pronunciation with *l* gained ground but slowly. Eighteenth-century poets like Pope and Swift rime *fault* with *thought* and *wrought*, and in 1755 Johnson states that in conversation the *l* is usually suppressed. It was not until the nineteenth century that the modern pronunciation was universally adopted by the educated classes, while in many dialects the old pronunciation still prevails.

Anglo-Norman *autour*, Old French *autor*, from Latin *auctor*, appears in Middle English as *autour*, *autor*, which remained the basis of the pronunciation till the seventeenth century. An etymological spelling with *c* : *auctor*, *auctour*, which in Old French occasionally appeared in the fourteenth century and became the ordinary English form in the fifteenth to sixteenth centuries, did not leave a lasting trace in pronunciation.

But a new learned variant with *th*, due to false analogy with Greek words like *authentic*, appeared in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century French ; it was adopted by English writers from 1550 onwards, first in the form *aucthour*, and came to produce a definite change in the pronunciation of the word. While Johnson still demanded the correct *t*, it is now universally pronounced with *th*. In a similar way the Latin name *Antonius* has been written *Anthony* since the sixteenth century ; and though here the correct pronunciation with *t* seems still to be the prevailing one, a pronunciation with *th* can occasionally be heard.

An interesting example of spelling-pronunciation is afforded by some Scottish words and proper names with *z*. The Old English letter for consonantal *i* which closely resembled the old form of *z* (ȝ), was gradually replaced by *y* in Middle English generally, but in some dialects, especially in Scottish, it was preserved till Modern English times, and after the introduction of the printing-press it was commonly represented by *z* in print. This *z*, which appears in Scottish words like *gaberlunzie*, *capercailzie* (beside *capercailye*), and in proper names like *Dalziel*, *Menzies*, *Mackenzie* (beside *Mackennie*), was erroneously pronounced *z* by Englishmen who were not aware of the proper Scottish pronunciation ; and so some of these words are now universally pronounced with *z*.

The pronunciation of each living word is of course carefully marked in the 'New English Dictionary.' In the case of words with doubtful pronunciation, it is true, especially in the earlier volumes, one would sometimes be thankful for a more detailed statement and discussion of the variant pronunciations, on the same scale of thoroughness with which the spelling-variations are treated. But, on the whole, the statements of pronunciation given in brackets after the catchwords are perfectly satisfactory. The transcription used is exceedingly clear and simple, and can easily be read even by a person unacquainted with phonetics.

A comparison of the catchword with the phonetic transcription will disclose even to a novice in philology the enormous difference between the written and spoken word in English. Whereas in German the orthography on the whole has followed the sound-changes that took place in the transition from Middle High German and during the New High German

period, English orthography has been in a state of torpor and fossilization for five hundred years. The English spelling of the present day corresponds to a state of pronunciation that was alive in Chaucer's days. Only in very rare cases has English orthography kept pace with phonetic changes, e.g. in words like *starve, carve, star, far, heart, smart, hearth,* which were written and pronounced *sterve, kerve, sterre, fer, herte, smert, herth* in Chaucer's time, and are thus connected with German *sterben, kerben, Stern, fern, Herz, Schmerz, Herd.* In most other cases the writing remained unaltered, whilst in pronunciation the most important changes took place in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Thus Middle English *ī* became diphthongized to *ai* (phonetically written) in words like *time, mine, ice*; *ū*, except in the Scottish dialect, was diphthongized to *au*, in *house, mouse, town, thou*, etc.; *ō* became *uu*, in *do, doom, boon, to, who*, etc.; narrow *ē* became *ī* in *be, bee, tree, deem, see*, etc.; *ā* was raised in the course of the sixteenth century to *ǣ*, which was afterwards narrowed to *ē* and diphthongized to *ei*, in words like *name, shame, able, acre, tale*; short *a* was similarly raised to short *æ* in the sixteenth century, and has in most cases preserved this pronunciation to the present day, e.g. *man, can, hand, lamb, had, as.* All these and many other sound-changes which radically altered the whole aspect of the language have found no reflex in orthography.

At various times from the seventeenth century onwards proposals have been made for bringing English spelling into closer harmony with the pronunciation. The nineteenth century, which witnessed the invention of phonography by Isaac Pitman and the rise of a new science of phonetics, was especially fruitful of such schemes. Spelling-reform societies were founded on this side and on the other side of the Atlantic; more or less radical systems of phonetic writing were proposed and laid before the public; some eminent philologists employed a simplified spelling in their own writings, in order to accustom the people to a reformed orthography; and a few years ago, at the suggestion of the American Simplified Spelling Board, President Roosevelt audaciously attempted to introduce the rules of simplified spelling into the official correspondence and publications of some of the United States Government Departments, but he soon found out that it was easier to

hunt lions in Usambara than to fight the Hydra of English orthography. As with their money and weights and measures, so in their spelling, the Anglo-Saxon races cling with proverbial conservatism to their time-honoured tradition, though the great advantages of a rational reform are obvious to everybody.

At the present moment the question has come nearer to occupying the public mind than ever before, thanks to the remarkable combination of expert knowledge and sweet reasonableness displayed in the skilful propaganda of the Simplified Spelling Society—though probably that society would be wise to begin by advocating fewer changes at first. It may be hard and even disconcerting for some people to imagine the present conventional orthography replaced by an approximately phonetic system, such as that advocated by the society. And indeed something can be said in favour of the traditional spelling, as was cleverly done in an interesting and suggestive paper 'On the relations between Spoken and 'Written Language, with special reference to English,' read at the International Historical Congress, in April 1913,* by Dr. Henry Bradley, who pleaded that writing originally had, and to a great extent still has, a primitive function of its own of directly expressing meaning, irrespective of the speech-sounds represented by the written letters; that 'in the mind 'of the man accustomed to reading the written form becomes 'part of the essence of a word,' so that 'for him the best 'spelling of a word is the usual one, because it enables him 'most quickly to identify the word.'

Yet it would be wrong to pay overmuch regard to the customary convenience of the ordinary adult reader. When the 'New Orthography' was introduced in Germany, in 1879 and 1880, there was a general outcry against it. It seemed to many people impossible to write *Altertum* instead of the time-honoured *Alterthum*, *Teil* instead of *Theil*, *Ware* for *Waare*; and *Tier* instead of *Thier* at first appeared like a fabulous monster. The Press was, with few exceptions, especially refractory and conservative in the matter. Bismarck strongly objected to the innovations of his Minister of Education, and in his own correspondence would have nothing to

* Printed in the Proceedings of the British Academy.

do with the new-fangled ways of writing. Yet, in spite of all this opposition, the reform, after having once been introduced into the schools, slowly but steadily made its way; and when, in 1901, a new 'Spelling Conference' was held in Berlin and its resolutions were sanctioned by the Governments of Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, and also adopted by the German schools in North America, there was hardly any stir whatever in public opinion, though the new regulations were farther-reaching and went deeper than the old.

There is therefore hope of a similar success attending a reform of English orthography some day. The Simplified Spelling Society has demonstrated that a scheme set on foot by specialists need not be hopelessly unpractical. The work of enlightening public opinion must go on some time longer until the cry for rational spelling becomes irresistible. Then will come conferences between philologists and schoolmasters, Cabinet Ministers and merchant princes, men from Edinburgh, Manchester, and London, delegates from England and America. When their suggestions crystallize it will only need the force of Government sanction in the elementary schools to compel all the other educational bodies in England and America, even if their present unorganised state continues, to fall into line.

But there is still another way of bringing spelling into harmony with speech: a reform of pronunciation too is needed. Sir James Murray has recommended that an effort should be made to restore the pronunciation of the *p* in words like *psalm, psalter, psychology,* etc. Dr. Bradley joins him in this proposal. The Poet Laureate has issued a dignified and earnest protest against the extreme tendencies of colloquial Southern English. The Simplified Spelling Society pleads for 'clear speech' as well as for 'clean spelling.'

Certainly more emphasis might well be laid on the teaching of correct pronunciation in schools. Cultivated English ladies have been heard to pronounce both *tower* and *tire* as *tah.* They were well-to-do men whose conversation 'Punch' recently reported as follows: A.—'I shall be a gay grass-'widower for the next two months—wife's gone for a holiday 'to the West Indies.' B.—'Jamaica?' A.—'No, it was 'her own idea.' It ought to be the duty of the schools to prevent corrupt and negligent pronunciations like these.

For this purpose a recognised standard of phonetic spelling would be of great educational value. Its introduction into schools would facilitate a more thorough training in correct pronunciation among children, and would lead to more attention being paid to speech by adults; it might thus prevent the degradation of words, as illustrated above, from becoming more general. There is no lack of systems of phonetic spelling for English speech. Perhaps the one adopted by Sir James Murray in the 'New English Dictionary' is as good, clear, and simple as any. The important thing, however, is that even an imperfect compromise like the system advocated by the Simplified Spelling Society would produce immediate effect on the capacity of children to discriminate speech-sounds.

But we must return to the Dictionary. Important as are its rulings upon spelling and pronunciation, even more value lies in the history it gives of the changes in the forms of words. A few examples will suffice to illustrate this cardinal feature.

According to a general law, Germanic *ai* (German *ei*) became long *ā* in Old English, long open *ǭ* in Middle English, and *ō"* in Modern English; German *Bein, Stein, Heim* are *bān, stān, hām* in Old English, *bǭn, stǭn, hǭm* in Middle English, and *bone, stone, home* in present-day English. But *one* is an exception to this rule. The development is all right down to Middle English: German *ein*, Old English *ān*, Middle English *ǭn*. The Modern English pronunciation should be *ō"n*, which actually appears in the cognate words *only, alone, atone*. The pronunciation *wʌn* has its origin in western dialects, where initial Middle English *ǭ* became *úo, uó, wo, wu, wʌ*; cf. the West Country pronunciations *wok, wots*, or *wuk, wuts*, or *wʌk, wʌts* for *oak, oats*. Again, the words *boat* (Old English *bāt*, Middle English *bǭt*) and *lodesman* (Middle English *lǭdesman*) are evidently somehow related to German *Boot* and *Lotse*, older *Lootsmann*. But the vowels, though identical, do not correspond historically: English *boat*, Middle English *bǭt*, Old English *bāt*, according to the above-mentioned rule, should be *beisz* in German, which form does not exist; and Middle English *lǭdesman* should be *Leitsmann* in German, which actually does occur as a proper name. The German words are both derived from English through the medium of

Dutch, where *boot* is recorded as early as 1250. Old English *bāt* has also found its way into Old Norse, where it occurs in the masculine form *bātr* by the side of a vernacular neuter subst. *beit*. These English loanwords in the other Germanic languages point to an early influence of Old English seafaring.

But English has borrowed far more than it has lent to foreign languages, the large percentage of foreign admixture being one of the most characteristic traits of the English vocabulary. Occasionally the same foreign word was borrowed two or three times, but at different periods. In this case it mostly appears in different forms, and the character of its sounds generally testifies to the period of the borrowing. For instance, Latin *sēcūrus* was early adopted by the Germanic languages and appears as *sihhur* in Old High German (Modern German *sicher*) and as *sicor* in Old English; *siker* is frequently used in Middle English, but becomes obsolete in literary English after 1500, though it can be found in North English and Scottish writers until recent times (e.g. *sickerly* in Sir Walter Scott). The Latin word became *sëur* in Old French, which was borrowed in Middle English and is preserved as *sure* in Modern English. In the sixteenth century the word was again borrowed, this time direct from the Latin, in the form *secure*.

The existence of doublets from the same root can also be due to the influence of varying stress to which the original word may have been exposed in the sentence. Thus Old English *ān*, when strongly stressed, became Middle English *ǭn*, New English *one*, but when unaccented it was shortened in Middle English to *an*, *a*, the indefinite article. Old English *abūtan* under strong stress was developed to Middle English *abūten*, New English *about*, while Old English *būtan* under weak stress was shortened to *but* in Middle English. Old English *ealswā* under strong sentence-stress was regularly developed to Middle English *alsǭ*, New English *also*; under weak stress it became in Middle English *alse*, *als*, *as*, New English *as*; so that *also* and *as* are originally the same word. It is similar with Modern English *naught* (or *nought*) and *not*, which are both derived from the same Old English word *nāwiht*, *nāht*, or *nōwiht*, *nōht*, under the influence of stress respectively strong or weak.

The most valuable feature in the 'New English Dictionary,' however, is the systematic arrangement and historical analysis of the different meanings of words. These are illustrated by more or less numerous dated quotations in chronological order. Frequently the history of a word is of peculiar interest. *Bead*, for example, comes from Middle English *bēde*, Old English *bedu*, the plural of a neuter substantive *bed* (or *gebed*, German *Gebet*), 'prayer.' Middle English *bēde* was taken for a singular, from which a new plural *bēdes* was formed. The name was transferred from 'prayers' to the small perforated balls of the rosary used for 'telling beads,' i.e. counting prayers said; and as the rosary was generally worn in two connected strings, it was usually called *a pair of bēdes* (thus in Chaucer). In late Middle English the meaning of *bead* was extended to its present sense of any small perforated, globular body of glass, amber, metal, wood, etc., used as an ornament.

Few people know that the American use of *I guess* in the sense of 'I think' retains the original meaning of Middle English *gessen*, 'estimate, think,' as found in Chaucer, Wyclif, and others, and used in England down to the seventeenth century (e.g. by Locke). The word is probably of Scandinavian origin. *Hearse* is originally the same word as *herse*, 'harrow.' Middle English *herse, hers, heers* was adopted from Old French *herse*, Italian *erpice*, from Latin *hirpicem*, accusative of *hirpex*, 'a large rake used as a harrow.' The primary meaning of the Middle English word was thus 'harrow.' It then was used for a triangular frame similar in form to the ancient harrow, designed to carry candles, and employed at services in Holy Week; or for an elaborate framework of other shape 'intended 'to carry a large number of lighted tapers and other decora- 'tions over the bier or coffin while placed in the church at the 'funerals of distinguished persons.' In the sixteenth century it came to denote 'a light framework of wood used to support 'the pall over the body at funerals; it fitted on to the parish 'bier and was probably adapted to carry lighted tapers.' Hence, about 1600, the name was transferred to the bier itself, and, in the seventeenth century, to the carriage constructed for carrying the coffin at a funeral. It is a long and uncommon way from Latin *hirpex*, 'harrow,' to the current use of English *hearse*, and it would be impossible to trace it without referring

to the earlier usages of the word as illustrated by numerous quotations in the 'New English Dictionary.'

It need not be said that a work of such enormous proportions cannot be infallible, and it would not be difficult to point out some erroneous statements and derivations, but on the whole the Dictionary is remarkably accurate and reliable down to the smallest detail. A discussion of minor points would be out of place here. But I wish to refer to two features of a more general import, in which a different arrangement seems advisable if ever a second edition of the great work should be contemplated.

First, I think all words that became obsolete during the Middle English period, from 1100 to 1500, might be excluded. If this had been done, much of the Middle English material at the disposal of the editors of the 'New English Dictionary' could have been used for compiling a large 'Middle English 'Dictionary' under a different editor, a work which certainly is a great desideratum, but will now in all probability remain unattempted for a long time to come.

Sir James Murray was certainly right in excluding the purely slang and dialect words. For the slang words there is 'The Slang Dictionary' (London 1864, second edition 1874), which requires to be issued in a new and completely revised form. The dialect words have been collected by *Dr. Joseph Wright* in his excellent and immensely useful 'English 'Dialect Dictionary' in six volumes, which began to appear in 1896, twelve years after the first instalment of the 'New 'English Dictionary,' and, after steady and rapid progress, was finished in 1905.

Perhaps Sir James would have done better to exclude the merely technical words as well, though the technical meanings of ordinary words certainly could not be ignored. The technical material might then have been used for the compilation of a special 'Technical Dictionary' on an historical basis.

By excluding the obsolete Middle English and the merely technical words the editors of the 'New English Dictionary' would have saved much time and space, and the Dictionary would probably have been finished by now. But, on the other hand, the inclusion of these words is certainly a great advantage to the work, and vastly widens the scope of its

appeal. We can only be grateful to Sir James Murray for bravely taking upon himself the great additional labour which he knew would be entailed.

After thirty-five years' incessant toil the completion of the gigantic work can now be said to be within reach of the eye. With the publication on the 31st of March of the last section of *Sh*, which finishes volume 8, the Oxford Dictionary stands complete from *A* to *Speech*. And as *T* is already published as far as *Trahysh*, only the small remainders of *S* and *T* and the whole of letters *U* to *Z* remain to be done. We may therefore look forward to the completion of the work in some five or six years. Already the number of words recorded in the Dictionary is 328,319, while the number of illustrative quotations is 1,426,379.

Sir James Murray is now seventy-seven years old and still in full health ; Dr. Bradley is sixty-eight, Dr. Craigie forty-six years of age. All lovers of the English language will sincerely wish that Sir James and his devoted helpers may live to see the completion of their great work. They have already earned for their immense labour, ungrudgingly given, and for the enormous amount of learning incorporated in this great Word-book, the thanks of the British nation and of all English-speakers and English-readers throughout the world.

J. Hoops.

A FRENCH SATIRIST IN ENGLAND

Poésies d'Auguste Barbier: Iambes et Poèmes. Paris: A. Lemaire. 1898.

IT becomes more and more difficult to find a place in the history of poetry for those writers who are by the development of events suddenly inspired to express their emotion, and who, when those events have passed by, find little or nothing left to say. The poetry of such men partakes of the nature of action; it is their share contributed to the energetic movement of their age. But, increasingly, we concentrate our attention on the poets who hold aloof from action, who write with equal indifference to their surroundings whether in a bower of roses or on a battlefield. We do so because these are the genuine and permanent artists, whose evolution is almost entirely unaffected by their conditions. Nevertheless, we have to take into consideration, also, the writers who are stung into lyrical expression by the vehemence of facts, such as Ebenezer Elliott by the Corn Law agitation, or Theodor Körner by the War of Liberation, or on a lower level Paul Déroulède by the events of 1870. It makes our general survey of the art imperfect if we ignore these poets, simply because they are difficult to fit into our scheme of æsthetics. Among such men of temporary genius, manifestly inspired by a certain succession of events, none is more curious than the poet of the Three Days' Revolution, the remarkable Auguste Barbier, who was lifted by the magnificence of his 'Iambes' to the highest apex of celebrity in 1830, and who died, completely forgotten, in 1882.

To comprehend the nature of Barbier's contribution to literature, we have to remind ourselves of the world upon which he made his violent and brief attack. A young man of five-and-twenty, hitherto unknown, he reeled on to the scene of Paris in a state of feverish exaltation, intoxicated with extravagant democracy, and waving a lighted torch in his hand. The wood of public opinion blazed at once, for it was absolutely ready for conflagration. The public seized

upon Barbier's first satires, on 'La Curée,' 'L'Idole,' and 'Popularité' in particular, because they expressed, in very fine verse, the sentiment of revolution which could not be smothered a moment longer. Joseph de Maistre had prophesied that there would surely be risings among the people, and the futility of Charles X. had gradually precipitated a change in France.

From the earliest days of 1830, it was evident to close observers that everything was tending towards a revolution in Paris. On the 3rd of January a new journal, 'Le 'National,' had begun to appear, under the editorship of Armand Carrel, and this at once became the organ of a new anti-royalist party; it was immensely read. Young Barbier and others of his kind were told in its columns that men must not be spared if France was to be free. Meanwhile the King stiffened himself to an absurd resistance; in March he responded in menacing language to the humble remonstrance of the Chamber, though presented by Guizot and Royer-Collard, and he prorogued Parliament for six months. Talleyrand advised the ministers to buy themselves estates in Switzerland, for their work in France was over. Charles X., supported by Polignac, refused all compromise, all argument with the Liberals; he was determined to be master in France; he said that what had cost his brother Louis XVI. his head had been his deplorable tendency to concession. He, for his part, if the people dared to be troublesome, would scourge them with scorpions. On the 26th of July his four famous ordinances were published in the 'Moniteur'; they abolished the liberty of the press, declared the Chamber dissolved, disfranchised three-quarters of the electors, and summoned the surviving fourth to choose a new Chamber.

That same evening an angry crowd gathered before the Palais Royal, and Polignac escaped from the midst of it on its march by leaping from his carriage and running like a hare. Next morning barricades began to rise in the streets, and at night blood began to flow. General Marmont, who had been given the command of Paris, wrote to the King, 'This has 'ceased to be a riot; it has become a revolution.' But Charles X., who was at St. Cloud, affected to observe nothing; while the tocsin rang, he dined at his usual hour, took his walk on the terrace, played with the Royal children till their bed-time,

and then settled to his game of whist. All night the sound of hammers and saws filled the air, and when morning broke on the 28th the tricolour was floating from all the spires, and the whole eastern section of Paris was in the hands of the insurgents. On the 29th, the Louvre, with Marmont in it, was captured by the people, who then entered the Tuileries without resistance. The Duke of Orleans put himself at the head of the populace, and Charles X. fled to Rambouillet, where he abdicated on the 2nd of August 1830. The briefest and one of the least bloody of revolutions was over.

When this revolution broke out, the news of it reached a young man of twenty-five, who was buried in the country, on an estate in the department of Seine-et-Marne. What he was doing there, or how he had been occupied up to that moment, does not seem to be recorded, for no biography of Auguste Barbier has ever been published. All we know is that he sought out General Jouanez, who was a resident of the same village, and gained permission to accompany him to Paris. Every violent and eager spirit was being drawn to the capital by the passion of change. The friends arrived on the 31st of July, to find Paris in all the chaos of civil war. They could not pass the barricades at Charenton, and so had to make a long round and get in by the Faubourg St. Antoine. They met wild troops of citizens shouting, and, in the midst of the turmoil a young man, ' en moustache et en habit bourgeois,' clasped Jouanez in his arms and shouted ' Mon Général, le peuple a ' été sublime ! ' Barbier left them folded in this enthusiastic embrace, and descended the steep and winding streets alone till he came out by the Arcade St. Jean on the Hôtel de Ville. There he had a shock of surprise, for the whole façade was riddled with shots, tricolour flags were waving from every window, and crowds of citizens, in the highest possible spirits, were entering and leaving the Hôtel like bees swarming in and out of a hive.

The sight of the very scene of the fiercest battle of democracy excited in Barbier a superhuman emotion. He gazed at it for a long time, and when at last he turned away it was with a beating heart and a tingling brain. He wandered along the quays, and the passion that was in him began to churn into music. There seems to be no record of his having previously indulged the ambition to be a poet, but ' La Curée '—which

has some claim to be considered the most splendid political poem ever written—formed itself in him as he walked along. It is as curious a case as occurs in the history of literature of the sudden revealing of an unsuspected power. There was much satiric poetry in that exciting time ; there were the songs of Béranger, which contributed largely to the fall of the Bourbons ; there were the ' Insurrection ' of Barthélemy and Méry, the copious ' Messéniennes ' of Casimir Delavigne, but all these are now impossible to read, the dreadful rhetoric of Casimir being particularly impenetrable. But the unique feature of ' La Curée ' is the freshness of its vehemence, the vitality of its serried drum-taps. After more than eighty years, what pulse but must be stirred by such verse as this :

' C'est que la Liberté n'est pas une comtesse
Du noble faubourg Saint-Germain,
Une femme qu'un cri fait tomber en faiblesse,
Qui met du blanc et du carmin :
C'est une forte femme aux puissantes mamelles,
À la voix rauque, aux durs appas,
Qui, du brun sur la peau, du feu dans les prunelles,
Agile et marchant à grands pas,
Se plaît aux cris du peuple, aux sanglantes mêlées,
Aux longs roulements des tambours,
À l'odeur de la poudre, aux lointaines volées
Des cloches et des canons sourds ;
Qui ne prend ses amours que dans la populace ;
Qui ne prête son large flanc
Qu'à des gens forts comme elle, et qui veut qu'on l'embrasse
Avec des bras rouges de sang.'

There was no other voice like it to be heard in France, and more than a year was to pass before Victor Hugo began his career as a political poet with ' Les Feuilles d'Automne.' Nothing could be more emphatic than the sudden accomplishment of the young Tyrtaeus of the barricade, and a few hours after ' La Curée ' was printed in the ' Revue de Paris ' the fame of its author was universal.

Auguste Barbier had been brought up in the fear and hatred of the legitimate régime. He loathed the very notion of a king, and it is notable that, while all the other romantics cultivated a worship for Napoleon, Barbier flouted the memory of the great Emperor as scornfully as he did the actual presence of Charles X. and Louis Philippe. His bellicose satires,

so many blasts on the trumpet of democracy, were collected early in 1831, under the title of ' Iambes,' and they achieved an unparalleled success. For a moment, Barbier was easily the first poet of France. His Biblical imprecations roused the nation like the accents of a new Ezekiel. Lamartine said that he had equalled Pindar and surpassed Juvenal. Balzac said that Barbier and Lamartine were the only great poets of the epoch. Sainte-Beuve, who afterwards turned against Barbier and repudiated him, was dazzled in 1831 by his extraordinary intrepidity in marshalling ' the most perilous ' images that ever a poet attempted.' The aged Rouget de Lisle read the ' Iambes ' in his retirement at Choisy-le-Roi, and murmured a *Nunc dimittis*. The ardent love of liberty and the impetuous virility of style which animated these rhetorical lyrics concealed for the moment their defects, and from 1830 to 1835 Barbier lived in a blaze of glory. But then his inspiration rapidly declined; after 1837 he scarcely published anything; forty-five years later he died at Nice (February 13, 1882), utterly neglected.

So much it has seemed necessary to say about a poet who has become a name and little more to living readers. But we do not propose upon this occasion to dwell on the merits of the once-famous ' Iambes,' or on the general history of Auguste Barbier. We wish to call attention to a volume of verse which has had a very remarkable fate, and which possesses a peculiar interest for English readers. It has the quality of being not merely entirely forgotten, but of never having been remembered. The great celebrity of Barbier lasted, as we have said, through the three or four earliest years of the reign of Louis Philippe, and then declined. Two years after the publication of the ' Iambes,' in 1833, he brought out a second collection of poems, ' Il Pianto,' descriptive of a sentimental visit which he had paid in the preceding year to ' noble et ' douce Italie, ô mère du vrai beau.' This was well received, but without enthusiasm. What people had enjoyed was Barbier's imprecations in accents of brass; they cared less for his whisperings through silver. Disagreeable things began to be said about him. Alfred de Musset, in a cruel satire, painted Auguste Barbier as a breathless little man, hurried along by four giantesses, his four favourite metaphors, who held him tightly by the collar and throttled him.

A contemporary panegyrist had compared the poet of the 'Iambes' to a naked athlete, suddenly leaping on a stage that was occupied by little dancers in ribands of silk and stars of tinsel. But when the athlete began to rig out his own limbs in the tinsel and silk of romantic poetry the democracy began to be bored with him.

He determined, it would seem, to be a naked athlete once more, but the early career of Louis Philippe gave his muse no opportunity of startling Paris. Barbier therefore formed the strange plan of invading England with a definite intention of attacking its social order. From a passage in one of the vague essays of his old age we learn that he was in London through a part of 1836, and it was doubtless at this time that he made the observations which inspire the fiery versification of his next volume, 'Lazare,' which appeared in Paris in 1837. This is a series of lyrical poems, often very elaborate in form, exclusively occupied with the dispraise of England. Various eminent characters, and notably Heine, whom Barbier met at Boulogne a little later, have expressed their dislike of our country, or our language, or our manners, in splenetic numbers, but we know no other case in which a poet of renown has filled an entire volume with nothing else. Moreover, the fate of 'Lazare' is almost unique. It has never, in these eighty years, been, we believe, so much as mentioned by any English writer, while the decline in Barbier's popularity and the altered feeling about England in France led to its being almost entirely ignored in Paris when it was published. It was a diatribe against the social life of England in the last year of William IV.; but before the author could publish it the girlish Victoria was on the throne, and the gallantry of France awoke to greet a new English monarch. The 'Lazare' of Barbier is therefore as little known as any work of its intrinsic merit in the literature of Europe, and it seems worth reviving, if only as an historical curiosity. Whether the recall of Talleyrand ('old Talley'), whom Palmerston had deeply offended, had anything to do with Barbier's anger, we must leave the political historians to decide, but there is some reason to think that the poet was admitted to the counsels of the old diplomatist after 1834.

The Prologue to 'Lazare' is supposed to be spoken by the poet as he leaves the coast of France to step on board that

great coal-ship, smoking on the bosom of Ocean, which calls itself 'Angleterre.' He announces the intention of his visit, which is to explore the horrors of our social system; and it is observable that he starts with anything but what can be called an open mind. His attitude is solemn and in truth a little inexplicable. He quotes a divine command to investigate and report upon the shocking condition of England. Lazarus, whom he is about to defend, is, by a strained metaphor, the English democracy, borne whither it would not go, by the strident machinery of the English State. The poet professes to believe that he runs great danger by unveiling whatever it may be that he shall find to unveil. England ceases to be a coaling-steamer and becomes a cliff-bound island as he intones :

'Je connais les débris qui recouvrent la plage,
Les mâts rompus et les corps morts ;
Mais il est dans le ciel un Dieu qui m'encourage
Et qui m'entraîne loin des bords.'

He anticipates horror, but prays that he may preserve truth. God has sent him forth, a tiny David, to pierce with the missile of verse the forehead of the giant Philistine, Albion. Surely, no holiday bard ever approached a country at peace with his own in so astonishing a spirit of defiance!

He withdraws from Boulogne, to reappear in London, which affects him with terror as it has affected many imaginative visitors from abroad, as fifty years later it affected the great Belgian poet, Verhaeren. In Barbier's descriptions, the absence of humour and the want of all relation with past experience combine to make the picture extravagantly dark. But such lines as the following, in spite of their exaggeration, may be read with the contemporary commentary of Dickens :

'Des chantiers en travail, des magasins ouverts,
Capables de tenir dans leurs flancs l'univers ;
Puis, un ciel tourmenté, nuage sur nuage ;
Le soleil comme un mort, le drap sur le visage,
Ou, parfois, dans les flots d'un air empoisonné
Montrant comme un mineur son front tout charbonné ;
Enfin, dans un amas de choses, sombre, immense,
Un peuple noir, vivant et mourant en silence.'

It would not be difficult to parallel these dismal lines by pages in 'Oliver Twist,' which was at that moment being composed.

Barbier did not fail to pay an early visit to Bedlam, that 'monument de crainte et de douleur,' which was then one of the dreadful shows in which foreigners delighted. It had lately been removed from its old station in Little Moorfields to the other side of the Thames. The famous Hospital of St. Mary Bethlem produced upon the mind of the French poet an effect more terrible than that of a sea in storm, more hideous than that of a conflagration, and he was haunted for days and nights by

> 'L'aspect tumultueux des pauvres créatures
> Qui vivent, ô Bedlam ! sous tes voûtes obscures ! '

A touch of national vanity seems to animate the violent poem, one of the least inspired in the volume, which Barbier dedicates to this distressing subject, since Charenton, which answered in Paris to Bedlam in London, had recently been reformed by the enlightened Dr. Esquirol, who had introduced into the arrangement and discipline of the great French asylum all kinds of improvements. Although the Quakers had done much to ameliorate the general condition of lunatics in some parts of England, their humanities had made little impression as yet in Bedlam, where the French poet, in 1836, saw the unhappy patients chained to the walls, and crippled with leglocks and coercion-chairs. Nor is he at all ahead of public opinion in his time. He admits, naïvely enough, that it would be impossible to examine this interesting 'tableau' of lunacy if the patients were not secured with handcuffs and straitwaistcoats. If any maniac were free to wander about :

> 'Ah ! malheur aux humains
> Qui tomberaient alors sous ses robustes mains.'

But his rage against England breaks out at the end, when he tells Bedlam that its 'temple' is fitly peopled by those who worship the national goddess of Dementia :

> 'Et que le ciel brumeux de la sombre Angleterre
> Peut servir largement de dôme au sanctuaire,'

a rather lumbering way of saying that all Englishmen are practically mad. 'Bedlam' is a bad poem, and its injustice is patent, for England was no worse in respect of its treatment of lunatics than other countries. A pity for insanity, a new sympathy, was being shown by many artists, and we may

remember a terrible picture by Goya and a still more sombre passage in Shelley's 'Julian and Maddalo,' but neither the poet nor the painter represented the conditions they illustrated as being specially to the shame of Spanish or of Italian humanity.

The moment when Barbier visited London appears to have been the darkest in our history with regard to the drinking of gin among the poor. Traill points out that the excesses of the gin-shops had led in 1834 to a condition which created the greatest alarm among such would-be social reformers as then existed, and indeed from that date onwards there began to be a diminution, slight at first, but continuous, in the proportion of spirit-licences to the population. An amateur census had revealed the terrific fact that a quarter of a million persons visited the gin-shops within a single week, 18,000 of them being children. Barbier seems to have witnessed some heart-rending scenes. In the poem called 'Le Gin' he says:

> 'L'enfance rose et se sèche et se fane;
> Les frais vieillards souillent leurs cheveux blancs;
> Les matelots désertent les haubans;
> Et par le froid, le brouillard et la bise,
> La femme vend jusques à sa chemise.'

A year before the Frenchman came amongst us, so cruelly 'taking notes,' a Select Committee of the House of Commons had sat to discuss what steps could be taken to diminish the horrors of drunkenness. But the public would have none of the reforms, such as Sunday closing and the reduction of duties on tea, coffee, and sugar, which the Select Committee proposed. The inhabitants of London still preferred, in a degree which we now find it difficult to conceive, to have their swinish wallowing in Gin Lane unconfined by law. William IV. had the majority of his subjects with him when he railed against the effeminacy of temperance, and it is well known that he forbade the drinking of water in the royal household. Modern teetotalism begins, oddly enough, in the very year in which Barbier wrote his stringent verses.

The French poet describes gin as being the universal drink of Londoners; but, as he speaks of its 'flot d'or,' it is possible that he confounded it with whisky. Whether alone or with its golden sister, however, he declares gin to be the goddess of

the great cities of England, and in one of those bold images of which he still had the secret he cries :

> ' Hélas ! la Mort est bientôt à l'ouvrage,
> Et pour répondre à la clameur sauvage,
> Son maigre bras frappe comme un taureau
> Le peuple anglais au sortir du caveau.'

On every hand the poet sees the mortality and degradation which dog the steps of drunkenness, and he spares no scorn for the depravity of the English people. Here and there a moralist may protest, and may try to rouse public opinion to the national disgrace. In vain :

> ' Partout le Gin et chancelle et s'abîme,
> Partout la Mort emporte sa victime.'

It is amusing, to say the least, to find the French satirist of 1836 using the same metaphor which was made so famous by W. T. Stead half a century later, and giving the title of 'Le Minotaure' to a flaming denunciation of what we have now learned to call the White Slave Traffic. One wonders where, in that reticent age, he found his statistics, but he has no hesitation in declaring that

> ' Le vieux Londres a besoin d'immoler tous les ans
> À ses amours honteux plus de cinquante enfants !
> Pour son vaste appétit il ravage la ville,
> Il dépeuple les champs, et par soixante mille,
> Soixante mille au moins, vont tomber sous ses coups
> Les plus beaux corps du monde et les cœurs les plus doux.'

It is impossible not to advance a certain charge of unfairness against the attitude of Barbier in this matter also, for he writes as though England were alone to blame among the countries of Europe. The subject is one which makes it undesirable to dwell here on a vigorous poem, the literary merit of which must be admitted. The poet cannot but have been aware of that depravity of manners which made a contemporary of his own describe Paris as ' la Grande Prostituée,' nor, in general terms at least, of the terrible facts which were, a few months later, exposed by F. A. Béraud in a too-famous work. But Barbier might have replied that two blacks do not make a white, and what seems to have shocked him particularly in London was the total apathy of the police and the deadly prudery of the public. ' Malheur,' he cries ' en

'ce pays aux pauvres Madeleines,' and he thunders forth his denunciation of a great city which calls itself Christian, and in which not a heart is found with courage enough to take pity on the sorrows of the fallen or a hand to dry their tears.

It would seem that Barbier visited Ireland, and a set of charming plaintive verses, very different from the usual form of 'Lazare,' are dedicated to 'Les Belles Collines d'Irlande.' He has witnessed the embarkation of a shipload of 'Exiles of Erin,' and his heart bled at the sight of a mass of human beings, driven on board like sheep, haggard with famine, and clothed solely in rags. He is almost needlessly unkind about these rags, for he calls them 'les haillons troués de la riche Angle-'terre.' He is also somewhat lacking in humour, as satirists are apt to be, for he anticipates the sarcasm of the statesman who said that the only real remedy for the woes of Ireland would be to tow her out into the Atlantic and sink her for twenty-four hours. Barbier seriously suggests that if the abominable tyranny of England weighs much longer upon the green Erin she 's'en irait sous les ondes.' It is a delightful picture, reminiscent of 'Alice's Adventures,' of the gaunt Britannia, with her long teeth, leaning a sharp elbow so heavily upon Ireland as to press her slowly down under the water. But in a book where almost everything is so ugly the last stanza of 'Les Belles Collines' is refreshing:

'Mais heureux les troupeaux qui paissent, vagabonds,
Les pâtures de trèfle en nos fraîches vallées!
Heureux les chers oiseaux qui chantent leurs chansons
Dans les bois frissonnants où passent leurs volées!
Oh! les vents sont bien doux dans nos prés murmurants,
Et les meules de foin ont des odeurs divines;
L'oseille et le cresson garnissent les courants
De tous vos clairs ruisseaux, ô mes belles collines!'

This is a charming picture, but only produced as a momentary foil to the hideousness of England.

Whether Barbier was at this time well acquainted with our language is not apparent, but he was certainly unfamiliar with our current literature. In a long and elaborate ode, entitled 'La Lyre d'Airain,' he points out that whereas wild Italy, and Germany the flaxen, and lyric France enjoy the possession of noble poets, 'la ténébreuse Angleterre' has no other instrument than a brazen lyre, of which the screaming

looms of her factories serve as strings. Polyhymnia, mother of harmony, smiles encouragingly on the other nations, but has only rough words for England. The poet, therefore, calls upon the sons of the other nations to listen to the voice of this angry Muse, to these notes struck on the strings of brass. They will distinguish human cries from myriads of slaves toiling in darkness and pain to fill the coffers of English pride. The picture he gives of millions of workers lifting impotent voices of despair to heaven is overwhelming. And the employer of labour is depicted as uniformly tyrannical, pitiless, and egotistical, protected by infamous laws, which support him in his worst excesses. There is not a chink of light in this dark picture.

Here, as elsewhere, the satire of the French poet is extravagant and unjust. But when he dwells upon the wretchedness of the dwellings of the English poor, on their miserable rates of wages, on the overcrowding, above all on the cruel modes of employing children, we feel that he had much reason to be angry. What no one would guess from his ferocious stanzas is that the Factory Act of 1833 and the Poor Law of 1834 had already begun to cause an improvement in social conditions. But possibly this was still mainly rural and hardly to be observed in the great towns. What, however, amounts almost to prevision on Barbier's part are the lamentations which he puts into the mouths of the children. These are often so exactly identical with those enshrined in Mrs. Browning's 'Cry of the Children' as to raise a question whether a stray copy of 'Lazare' may not have come into her hands. Her poem was written in 1843, and in direct reference to the Report of the Commission of 1842, but already in 1836 the French poet makes the children, dizzy with driving the wheels of iron all day long, yearn for a place where

> nos poitrines
> Ne se briseraient pas sur de froides machines,
> Et, la nuit nous laissant respirer ses pavots,
> Nous dormirons enfin comme les animaux.'
>
> ('If we cared for any meadows, it were merely
> To drop down in them and sleep.')

But a still more terrible picture of English manners is supplied by the long poem entitled 'La Tamise.' Barbier

must have been feeling exceedingly unwell when he sat down to compose this piece. He is not alone among poets, and especially foreign poets, in considering the Thames a very sinister phenomenon. But he outdoes the others; he writes as if the unfortunate river were Acheron and Phlegethon rolled into one. It forms a natural and almost an irresistible asylum for suicides; to walk along its black banks, to be pierced by its icy fog, is to despair of life itself. England is hell:

> 'Ah! si vous connaissiez cette île,
> Vous sauriez quel est cet enfer';

it is a country where charity and pity are unknown; 'où 'l'on ne prête à la misère l'oreille non plus que la main.' London rises along the Thames, menacing, black, a sooty wall of bronze. The poet is chilled to the heart by the muddy streets, the filthy smells, the icy rain. 'Oh!' he cries, 'la 'vie est affreuse à traîner dans ce lieu fatal!' He notes in high and low alike a total absence of sympathy for poverty or sorrow, and ever the horrible river glides by, carrying its suicides and its dead dogs and its nameless offal down to a squalid sea.

It is almost to be supposed that Barbier was in communication with some disaffected Englishman, who pointed out to him the national abuses which most loudly called for satire. Admittedly, in the 'thirties, the treatment of our army was the worst in our history; as has been said, the common soldier 'dragged out his existence under conditions which to us seem 'simply revolting.' But it is difficult to imagine how a young Frenchman, like Barbier, a mere visitor to our shores, came to know so much about it. The subject of 'Le Fouet' is neither more nor less than flogging in the army, a theme which, we may confidently hope, has inspired no other poet before or since. The English practice of whipping soldiers for every trifling delinquency excites in the French poet's bosom the most vehement indignation. He gives a description of the punishment so hideously vivid that we can hardly doubt that he was present at an execution of the kind. Such monstrosities, he avers, could take place only within the base and cruel 'Albion, cœur de roche,' and he puts into the mouths of the miserable soldiers a lyric cry of despair and

appeal. Through his verse, these wretched men call upon England to desist from her cruelties, and they declare that

'Ses murailles de chair, ses soldats valeureux,
Sont traités par ses mains comme on traite les bœufs.'

The curious unfairness of Barbier must from the very first have alienated sympathy from his diatribes. Was it not M. de Thiard who said that he was very fond of the pastorals of M. de Florian, but that they would be improved by a wolf here and there? Conversely, we may say that Barbier's fuscous paintings of English society would be improved by a gleam of light here and there. In the stern poem called 'Les Mineurs de Newcastle' he makes many just reflections on the terrible dangers and the cruel monotony of subterranean industry, but he writes exactly as though there were no mines—as, in a previous poem, no looms—in any other part of the world but in this detestable and deplorable Albion. Sir Humphry Davy's invention, it is true, is mentioned as

'la lampe salutaire
Qu'un ami des humains fit pour le noir mineur.'

It is probable that Barbier did not exaggerate in the least the terrible conditions under which miners of both sexes and every age were working when he visited England. There was practically no legislation to regulate the slavery, for it was nothing less, under which the miners in the north of England languished. Nor was the apathy of public opinion shaken until Lord Ashley's Bill of 1842, following upon a Royal Commission earlier in the same year, awakened the conscience of the House of Commons. It is therefore somewhat extraordinary to find a French poet, so early as 1836, putting these words into the mouths of the miners of Newcastle:

'O Dieu! Dieu tout-puissant! pour les plus justes causes
Nous ne demandons pas le tumulte des choses,
Et le renversement de l'ordre d'ici-bas; . . .
Ce dont nous te prions, enfants de la misère,
C'est d'amollir le cœur des puissants de la terre,
Et d'en faire pour nous un plus solide appui;
C'est de leur rappeler sans cesse, par exemple,
Qu'en laissant dépérir les fondements du temple,
Le monument s'écroule et tout tombe avec lui.'

Somewhere in London, perhaps at the East India House,

Barbier found a sinister toy which had been constructed for the private pleasure of Tippoo Sahib, and which is now in the Indian Museum at South Kensington. It represented a life-sized manikin carefully dressed in the uniform of an English soldier, and a mechanical tiger, which, being wound up, seized the trooper in its claws and tore him, while the instrument gave forth noises which were supposed to be the dying shrieks of the Englishman. This playful 'joujou d'un Sultan' was one of the objects in London which pleased the French poet most; he describes it with extreme gusto. His own sympathies, of course, are entirely with Tippoo and with the tiger, and not at all with 'ces Clives, ces Hastings de sinistre mémoire.' His anger against England is nowhere more extravagant than in relation to India, where he charges us with causing famines on purpose. His temper of mind is revealed by the confession that when some great London lady was giving a rout, her windows a blaze of light, Barbier stood on the pavement, cursing the guests as they entered.

It was not to be expected that a poet of revolution, in a very bad temper, should visit England without expatiating on the exclusion of Byron from the national Valhalla. Although the decision of the Dean was a dozen years old, the fame of it still vibrated throughout Europe. This was, probably, the most notorious act of England, in Continental opinion, since Waterloo. Its causes were not comprehended, and it was set down to unadulterated hypocrisy and cant. The poem entitled 'West-'minster' is one of the longest and the most vigorous in Barbier's volume. The opening stanzas of it are put into the mouth of Byron himself, who exclaims that the odious attacks of the British public

> 'rendirent mon cœur plus noir et plus amer
> Que le fenouil sauvage arraché par la mer,
> Et le flot écumeux que la sombre nature
> Autour de l'Angleterre a roulé pour ceinture.'

The French poet, whose voice is not to be distinguished from that of Byron, replies to the angry ghost in accents not less furious. The Abbey, noble as it is, fills him with rage, and its sepulchral beauties rouse in him a passion of rebellion. He declares that none are any longer buried there but the pompous and their slaves. The phantoms of the free flap in vain for entrance against the high, dim windows of the

Minster; and their funereal clamours, so haughtily disdained by the arrogant snobbishness of England, rouse the rest of the universe to indignation.

Another long poem, 'Les Hustings,' is a sort of eclogue, in which 'Menace' and 'Corruption' address and answer one another on the electoral abuses of England. It is not a little curious that Dickens should have been describing the contest of Slumkey and Fizkin for the parliamentary representation of the borough of Eatanswill at the very moment when Auguste Barbier was treating the same subject from the gravest point of view possible. The French poet might really have been the veritable Count Smorltork whom Mr. Pickwick found taking notes at Mrs. Leo Hunter's garden-party. In a certain sense, although Dickens is so sparkling and Barbier so gloomy, these accounts of our electoral practices in 1836 do closely confirm one another. The French poet describes the total absence of virtuous independence in the electorate. Money pours in in floods, and the elector will be turned out of his house if he refuses to vote as his landlord wishes. It has been so in England for five hundred years, and all the electorate, Radicals and Tories, Papists and Protestants, are equally infamous and venal. The closing stanzas are worth quoting. Corruption cries:

'O Menace, ô ma sœur, à grands pas avançons:
Déjà la foule ardente, au bruit de la fanfare,
Roule autour des hustings en épais tourbillons:
Pour emporter d'assaut le scrutin qu'on prépare,
Fais jaillir la terreur du fond de tes poumons.'

To which Menace replies:

'Et toi, Corruption! répands l'or à main pleine,
Verse le flot impur sur l'immense troupeau:
Qu'il envahisse tout, les hustings et l'arène,
Et que la Liberté, présente à ce tableau,
Voile son front divin de sa toge romaine.'

These sinister verses might have been printed as an epigraph to chapter 13 of Mr. Pickwick's celebrated Memoirs.

It will be observed that international politics take little or no part in the varied contents of 'Lazare.' There is, however, a slight exception to this in the ode called 'Le Pilote,' on the form of which, by the way, the influence of André Chénier is strongly felt. The Pilot is William Pitt, that 'homme au

'large et froid cerveau,' who, although he has been dead for thirty years, still cries 'Carnage!' and sets loose the dogs of war on Europe. That he opposed France by a coalition of nations is not forgotten, and he is reproached for imposing on his own country 'l'impôt et ses énormes poids' for the sake of keeping up this menace, and of tearing from the burning kisses of France the forehead of her sister England:

'O William Pitt, ô nocher souverain!
O pilote à la forte tête!
Il est bien vrai que ton cornet d'airain
Domina toujours la tempête;
Qu'inébranlable et ferme au gouvernail
Comme un Neptune tu sus faire
Devant ta voix tomber le sourd travail
De la grande onde populaire.'

Lord Melbourne is a transient phantom whom Barbier disdains to name.

If we make allowance for the almost perverse determination on the part of Barbier to see nothing English in a roseate light, the exactitude and the width of his observations are certainly very remarkable. We have compared him with his fictitious contemporary, Count Smorltork, but he is distinguished from that credulous visitor by his accuracy. Barbier's mistakes are all errors of omission, and have the air of being wilful. He is singularly exempt from those blunders to which a foreigner, and in particular an unfriendly foreigner, is liable in his animadversions of another country. So exact is he, even in his malignity, that we find ourselves wondering by what means he gathered together facts which he certainly did not find in the British newspapers of that day. It is the gift of a satirist to detect our faults when we have not noticed them ourselves. From this point of view no poem in 'Lazare' is more clairvoyant than that which is dedicated to Shakespeare. Here he hits upon a national error which no contemporary observed. During the reign of William IV. the neglect of the study of Shakespeare, whether on the boards or in the library, reached a lower point than it had known for a century and a half. No important edition, no celebrated performance, no weighty commentary on the plays, belong to that reign, during which it was the newly awakened zeal of German scholarship which kept the memory of the poet alive in Europe.

Barbier declares that (in 1836) Shakespeare is wholly forgotten in Great Britain. His temples are deserted, his admirers are silent. Albion has lost all taste for his divine symbols. A superficial observer, looking at the English theatres, at English books and newspapers, might well be excused for believing that Shakespeare's very name is about to be swallowed up in eternal oblivion. No one acts him, no one praises him, no one cares about his memory. (This, if we look into the dates, is true enough; it was not until five or six years later, in the 'forties, that the personal revival of Shakespeare began.) But the French poet refuses to be cast down, and he breaks into a really eloquent tribute to the poet of Stratford—a tribute which seems to have escaped the notice of all those who compile Shakespearian anthologies. No quotation from 'Lazare' could give a more favourable impression of Barbier's poetical genius than the passage which closes in these generous stanzas:

'O toi qui fus l'enfant de la grande nature,
Robuste nourrisson dans ses deux bras porté;
Toi qui, mordant le bout de sa mamelle pure,
D'une lèvre puissante y bus la vérité;

Tout ce que ta pensée a touché de son aile,
Tout ce que ton regard a fait naître ici-bas,
Tout ce qu'il a paré d'une forme nouvelle
Croîtra dans l'avenir sans crainte du trépas.

Shakespeare! vainement sous les voûtes suprêmes
Passe le vil troupeau des mortels inconstants,
Comme du sable, en vain sur l'abîme des temps
L'un par l'autre écrasés s'entassent les systèmes:

Ton génie est pareil au soleil radieux
Qui, toujours immobile au haut de l'empyrée,
Verse tranquillement sa lumière sacrée
Sur la folle rumeur des flots tumultueux.'

This recalls the 'Others abide our Question' of Matthew Arnold, but preceded it by at least a dozen years.

Although Barbier, as we have indicated, was remarkably well-informed about the exterior of English life, he would not have been a Frenchman of his time if he had escaped the tradition of the 'spleen.' He is superior to the common legends of long teeth, wife-selling, and raw beef, but he succumbs

to the theory of a mysterious wasting disease peculiar to the British Islands. The attribution of this malady—'the mind's 'wrong bias,' as its laureate had called it—to inhabitants of this realm had long been admitted by the eighteenth century, but hardly to the exclusion of other claimants. We have not discovered an earlier source of the legend than Voltaire, who perhaps introduced the word, as well as the idea, into France from England, and who claimed the spleen as our national disease. Barbier, in a poem of great merit, describes it as a kind of mortal *ennui*, 'prince des scorpions,' scourge of our nation. He tells the inhabitants of this island that notwithstanding her boxers, her jockeys and her foxes, England is not really entertained by anything, and that the spleen, with its nine-fold lash, is whipping all her citizens to suicide. He makes a curious reference to the running of railways, which is early indeed when we reflect that the Great Western Bill had only just overcome the resistance of Eton and Oxford, and passed into law; he says that England has taken to running railway-trains in order to rouse her spirits, but they will have no other result than to hurry Englishmen faster down to hell. He regards the recent invention of the steamer with a no less jaundiced eye.

In another poem, after charging the English with a gross indifference to the beauties of nature, and with being ready to destroy all the amenities of landscape for the sake of making a few pounds, he hits on one of his violent images and presents to us the genius of machinery as a giant hippopotamus, 'insensible animal,' trampling and rolling upon the glory of the earth. This final poem, 'La Nature,' ends, however, with a passage of real beauty, where the poet foresees a radiant future for the unhappy Albion, when its present possessors have disappeared (mown down, perhaps, by 'le 'spleen') and Britain rejoices at last in the protection of those divine presences, the Eagle and Liberty. An Epilogue to 'Lazare' tells the reader that Barbier has polished these rhymes as a mirror in which the Mother of Sorrows may see her face reflected. His object has been to awaken terror and pity in the heart of Europe, and so he closes his strange book, with a sort of Ronsard-like hymn, half charming and half ridiculous.

The complete oblivion which immediately fell upon this

volume can be accounted for in several ways. Reaction against the exaggerated fame of the author of the 'Iambes' led at that moment to a no less excessive depreciation, so that, merely as poetry, Barbier's work failed to awaken interest. As an attack on English manners and the ruling class in Great Britain, the change in Parisian feeling caused by the death of William IV. and the interesting accession of the girlish Victoria made the diatribes which 'Lazare' contained tactless and ill-timed. Such satire was a kind of bad manners. It was therefore neglected in Paris, and the poet fell into great obscurity. In England, on the other hand, it is almost certain that the volume never came under the notice of any critic, nor perhaps of any reader. Now, after nearly eighty years, when England and France understand each other so perfectly, it may be presented as an amusing curiosity of literature which can do nothing but excite a smile on either side of the Channel.

EDMUND GOSSE.

IRISH VICEROYS BEFORE THE UNION

1. **Correspondence and Manuscripts of James, First Earl of Charlemont.** Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1891–94.
2. **Manuscripts of the Marquis of Lothian.** Wyman. 1905.
3. **Manuscripts of Mrs. Stopford-Sackville.** Vol. I. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1904.
4. **Manuscripts of J. B. Fortescue, Esq.** Vols. I., II., III. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1892–99.
5. **Manuscripts of the Duke of Rutland.** Vols. II., III. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1889–94.

THE reputation of the Earl of Chesterfield is still weighted by Dr. Johnson's famous letter, and his own epistles to his son are a further hindrance to an impartial appreciation of his genuine abilities. Philip Dormer Stanhope was emphatically not the callous patron of Johnson's imagination, nor was he solely either the mould of fashion or the high priest of immorality. That Chesterfield was a diplomatist of consummate finesse is proved by his mission to The Hague; that he had the qualities of a great statesman needs no further demonstration than the phenomenal success of his Irish viceroyalty. His success at The Hague is well known; it is a less familiar fact that his lord-lieutenancy of Ireland was a kindly tradition in that country for many generations. Patriots and officials were united in his praise. The latter were always hoping for his return 'to quiet the minds of the people'; the former sadly confessed that 'such a viceroy as Lord Chesterfield 'is not often to be found.' Yet he had less than nine months in which to establish his reputation. Nor, in one sense, did he regard his task too seriously. On the eve of his departure for Dublin he expressed his delight at the prospect of leaving the 'busy and disagreeable scene' in London for one much better suited to his temper and inclination, 'where the Duke of 'Shrewsbury said that he had business enough to hinder him 'from falling asleep, and not enough to hinder him from sleep-'ing, a pleasing description to a half-lazy man such as I am.'

But his half-laziness was not carried to a dangerous extreme.

If he did not, like one of his zealous successors, deny himself exercise and sleep, or emulate that laborious viceroy by drawing on his boots at seven in the morning and sitting at business till near five in the evening, he neglected no duty essential to his office. For form's sake he duly appointed a secretary, but he informed that fortunate individual that his sole task would be to receive the emoluments of his position: 'I will do the 'business myself,' he added, 'being determined to have no 'first minister.' Chesterfield was equally resolved to be untrammelled by mistress or favourite. All this was a startling innovation for those nursing-fathers of previous viceroys who waited upon him on his arrival with long lists of the majorities they could command in the House of Commons. 'I should have been extremely glad to accept your services, 'gentlemen,' he remarked, 'but I have just bespoke a yard 'and a half of Parliament of the Speaker.' If, too, the official ring had hopes of the beauty of Miss Ambrose they were equally disappointed. Chesterfield turned her a poetic compliment, and described her as the only 'dangerous papist' he knew; but succumbed no farther.

No viceroy of the eighteenth century subscribed more completely to the doctrine of *suaviter in modo, fortiter in re.* To the alarmist who reported one morning that the people of Connaught were 'rising,' he answered, taking out his watch, 'It is 'nine o'clock, and certainly time for them to rise'; to the busybody who assured him that one of his coachmen was a Roman Catholic and went to mass, he rejoined 'Well, I will take care 'he shall never drive me there'; but to a suspected agitator he roundly declared he would be 'worse than Cromwell' in dealing with all disturbers of the peace. As usual, everybody wanted to govern, whereas he had reserved that function for himself. Jobbery he repressed with a relentless hand; intolerance, whether to Catholics or Protestants, was as firmly restrained; and, on the positive side, every encouragement was given to legislation calculated to improve the educational and commercial conditions of the country. But the man was more than his measures. The 'great arts' of government, such as providing jobs for favourites and sops for enemies, were above him; he was contented, he confessed, with the more modest rôle of wishing Ireland all possible good, and desired to be remembered as 'the Irish Lord Lieutenant'

rather than as 'the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.' If Lady Chesterfield placated national sentiment by wearing the dress material of the country, and if the viceroy's Castle banquets were so generous as to account for his £5000 deficit on his term of office, it was Chesterfield's lenient yet firm personality which contributed most to his success.

Yet the moral of his administration was wasted on his successors. If some of them were his equals in conviviality, none of them possessed or were able to cultivate his gift for managing men. Consequently the power of the 'undertakers' waxed stronger with each new viceroy. That was inevitable in view of the form of government favoured by the English Cabinet. Prior to the term of Lord Townshend, the Lord Lieutenant resided in Ireland only during a part of the year, his powers while absent being wielded by a commission of Lords Justices, who, in turn, were in league with a small group of landowners and borough proprietors. As these 'undertakers,' so called because they guaranteed—on terms—to carry on the government, were constantly resident in Ireland, their power was naturally greater than that of the viceroy, who, on his arrival, was consigned to their care and given to understand that they and they alone could make or mar his administration. If the newcomer declined to buy 'a yard and a half of Parliament' on the usual terms, his position was made unbearable.

But America and George III. changed all that. When the colonists across the Atlantic half-masted their flags and rang peals of muffled bells for the passing of the Stamp Act they were also commemorating the demise of the Irish undertakers, for the new spirit in America convinced English statesmen that what the colonists did to-day the Irish might do to-morrow. It was that fear, the fear of a scouting of central authority, plus the determination of George III. to make all power depend upon the Crown, which instigated a memorable innovation in Irish government.

Such a task would have been congenial to Chesterfield; unfortunately the peer to whom it was entrusted—Lord Townshend—was unequal to its execution. Certainly the difficulties were appalling.

'It must have been evident to many' (wrote an impartial Dublin observer) 'that fixed Lords-Justices so frequent and long in power, to whom the Irish looked up for their preferment, so far attached

all Parliamentary interest to themselves, that our Lord-Lieutenants could have no independent weight, but must be under the control of the Irish governors, who, having also their separate interests, embarrassed the Lieutenant, and threw the nation into factitious parties, to the obstruction of all public business, and the support of private jobs.'

That this was a truthful prediction Lord Townshend quickly discovered. The transference of patronage was a slow process, not to be accomplished during one lord-lieutenancy; apart from wholesale dismissals, which the English Cabinet had not the courage to advise, the attrition of death and the creation of new places and peerages were the only alternatives for accumulating a supply of 'sops.' Hence his Excellency was in despair.

Yet Townshend had arrived in Dublin bearing gifts. One of these, suitably garnished with viceregal adjectives, was proffered in his speech at the opening of Parliament. As nothing was more conducive to the rights and liberties of the people than the independency of the judges of the land, he had been charged by His Majesty to recommend such a measure as should secure the judges in their offices 'during their good behaviour.' Such a boon was highly congenial to Irish sentiment; but when the Parliament had framed and passed a *quamdiu se bene gesserit* Bill, Townshend's first attempt to weaken the 'undertakers' was ruined by an English amendment making judges removable by an address of the Lords and Commons. The responsibility for this blunder has never been located; all that transpires from Townshend's private letters is that he had to endure the indignation of the Irish and the rebuke of Lord Shelburne for mentioning the matter in his speech. It was hard, he said, after his 'trouble' and 'sacrifices,' to be so 'chided' by Shelburne in his first dispatch.

His second venture was more fortunate. In many a session prior to his viceroyalty efforts had been made, first by Dr. Lucas and then by Henry Flood, to pass a measure limiting the duration of Parliament, which, at this period, was conterminous with the life of the reigning sovereign. If the heads of a Bill for that purpose passed in the Commons, the measure was either demolished by the Privy Council or rejected by the English Ministry, an order of procedure upon which the Commons relied whenever they adopted the patriotic pose of

seeming to defer to the wishes of the people. The farce was repeated in Townshend's first Parliament. Popular demand for a limited Parliament had become so clamorous that the Commons once more passed the heads of a Bill for that purpose. But from this stage the comedy became a tragedy—for the Commons. Angered at being so often made the scapegoat, the Privy Council certified the Bill to London, expecting it would meet its usual fate there. And now another surprise happened. The English Ministry, also weary of battledore and shuttlecock tactics, and determined to saddle the undertakers with the odium of defeat, agreed to the measure with an additional clause dissolving the sitting Parliament ! The effect in Dublin was described by Lord Charlemont in his private memoirs.

'On the day when this unexpected account arrived from England I happened to dine with Mr. Ponsonby, then Speaker of the House of Commons, and the principal "undertaker" for government. The company was numerous. His English letters were brought to him while we were yet at table. He opened them. His countenance fell. He turned pale, and it was visible to everyone that some fatal news had been received. "What is the matter ?" "By heavens, the Limitation Bill is returned, and Parliament is dissolved." Never did I see in one group so many doleful faces, nor to me so laughable a sight. I presently left the company, where I was the only person pleased, and hurried to Flood, to communicate the good tidings. Care was now taken that the public exultation should be made manifest, and the city of Dublin was one continued bonfire. The country was also immediately informed that the favourite law was returned, and the whole kingdom resounded with acclamation.'

That adroit campaign of publicity achieved its end. When the Octennial Bill once more came up for discussion in the Lower House the building was surrounded by such an excited crowd that, much as they detested the measure, the Commons had no option save to pass it. In the Lords it was debated and carried in one day, for the peers were keenly alive to the fact that henceforward they would be able to auction their boroughs every eight years instead of once in a sovereign's lifetime. If Townshend did not initiate the Bill, he could have prevailed with the English Cabinet to repress it. On the contrary, he urged its adoption.

'I hope in God you'll return the Octennial Bill soon. It is essential to the augmentation, and I think will make government

with respect to parties more practicable here. The people, who are poor and oppressed, implore it; the nation expects it, and many who will recommend it hate it, and privately wish it may be rejected, because the rejecting it will make the British Government odious and themselves more necessary.'

However he fared with the angry Commons, who thwarted him at every turn, for a time Townshend was transfigured in popular estimation by the reflected glory of the Octennial Act. He needed all that compensation. If he 'drank furiously' in the early days of his viceroyalty, he could plead the 'abominably unwholesome' air of the Castle in extenuation, plus that attention to business which kept him in his boots from seven till five, not to mention his prospect of being at least £8000 in debt. Even Lord Charlemont admitted that Townshend's administration deserved to be remembered with 'some degree of satisfaction,' owing to it having rescued the country from the bondage of the undertakers—a testimonial of singular value as coming from a man who, notwithstanding his undoubted probity and disinterestedness, had a supreme confidence in the infallibility of his own opinions.

But there were troubles in store for the sponsor of the Octennial Act. In return for his sops he was expected to obtain, among other measures, a much-needed augmentation of the army, which he was not able to secure until the meeting of the new Parliament. It was during that Parliament, however, that Townshend's administration encountered the rock which effected its shipwreck. The undertakers plotted a scheme for the restoration of their authority, and the certifying of a Money Bill by the Privy Council gave them their opportunity, for the Commons rejected that measure on the ground that it had not originated in their House. Townshend met the opposition by delivering an impassioned protest and proroguing Parliament; but although he did at last secure a majority, he had aroused such determined hostility, the embers of which still glow in the pages of 'Baratariana,' that he had to be recalled.

His policy was continued by his successor, Earl Harcourt—whom Walpole described as 'civil and sheepish' and Wraxall as 'too grave and measured in his manners'—to the extent of creating places and pensions; otherwise the new viceroy contented himself with the ornamental functions of his position, leaving

business and intrigue to his secretary. The two most notable events of Harcourt's administration were an attempt to pass an Absentee Tax and the defection of Henry Flood. An Absentee Tax had long been popular with the patriots, and the necessity of replenishing the exchequer to defray the cost of new offices and pensions prompted the viceregal secretary to favour a measure which would supply him with funds and make him the hero of the people. Besides, such a tax would fall most heavily upon those absent Irish Whigs who were the stoutest foes of the ministry in England. Flood and Charlemont gave the Bill their patriotic blessing; but the absent Whigs were able to bring such pressure on the English Cabinet that in the end the measure it had adopted was rejected by the Irish Parliament. After such a quick change it is perhaps little surprising that the leader of the patriots should have become a Castle official. That was a sore trial to Lord Charlemont. That Flood, the champion of his country, 'the bulwark of her liberties, her strong tower of defence 'against all assailants,' should have deserted 'the glorious 'cause' was a 'ruinous, irreparable' defection. Of course Flood protested that he had changed sides for 'the good of 'the cause,' that from the vantage ground of office he would be better able to advance the measures dear to the patriot heart; but there were many who, with an eye on his £3500 salary, had a suspicion that 'the handful of silver' was the most potent factor in his desertion. And that suspicion hardened when the late patriot agreed to the embargo on Irish exports and to the drafting of four thousand Irish troops for service in America.

Harcourt's viceroyalty, however, was peaceful and uneventful compared with that of Lord Buckinghamshire. How he secured the appointment is a mystery. When the office was declined by the Earl of Dartmouth on the plea that it was certain to be 'productive of disgrace and misery to himself 'and the public,' George III. and Lord North were at their wits' end to find a 'decent peer' fit for the position. 'As to 'Lord Buckinghamshire,' said the King, 'he has been knocking 'at every door. I am therefore resolved not to accept of him.' So he wrote in the October of 1776, but two months later he signed the warrant for his appointment.

Unlike Chesterfield, who was bored by the trappings and

fanfaring of his office, Buckinghamshire seems to have been enamoured of the outward shows of his substitutionary royalty. News of one of his showy innovations reached a friend in London, who commented upon it in these terms:

'Your Excellency seems to intend the turning over a new leaf in Ireland, by getting rid of King James' robes; if you had not told me so, I should have had no notion that any chief Governor would have worn them after the battle of the Boyne. I wish all rags in Church and State as well disposed of; I shall be happy to hear when your Parliament meets that the Lord Lieutenant *novo splendore resurgit.*'

Unfortunately Lord Buckinghamshire's new robes were practically the only resplendent feature of his administration. The embargo was a millstone round his neck; many of his promotion recommendations were ignored by the King; Irish affairs were discussed in London without any reference to his views; his official speeches were criticised alike for what they contained and what they did not; he was powerless to defeat a short Money Bill; and if he was able to pass a perpetual instead of a limited Mutiny Bill, and to secure the rejection of Grattan's motion for a Declaration of Rights, the rise of the Volunteer movement and the adoption of a resolution in favour of free trade were regarded as outweighing any slight successes he had achieved. 'Do not suspect me,' he pleaded with the London Cabinet, 'of ambitioning the 'character of an Irish patriot'; but that Cabinet, powerless in the toils of the American rebellion, and angered by secret reports of the 'weakness' of the viceroy, held him responsible for the necessity to grant a relaxation of the restrictions on the woollen and other industries. Yet Buckinghamshire cannot be held accountable for the origin and growth of the Volunteer movement. To assert, as the usually accurate Lecky did, that he regarded the uprising with impotent dismay, is unjust as well as untrue; there would be as much reason to behead the hapless Mr. Birrell for permitting the organisation of the new Ulster Volunteers. For, as all the world knows now, Ulster has a natural gift of self-dependence. And that spirit was as marked in 1778 as in 1914. In fact there is a striking but unregarded parallel between the Ulster revolt against Home Rule and the Volunteer organisation of the eighteenth century, the only difference being in the nature of the threatened

danger. In 1778 it was the imminence of a French invasion which prompted the mayor of Belfast to apply to the Lord-Lieutenant for a military force. He asked in vain. The war with America had depleted the English navy and army, while of the troops nominally stationed in Ireland less than a third remained in the country. All that the Castle could offer the mayor of Belfast was a couple of ill-equipped half-companies. The viceroy's extremity was Ulster's opportunity. As in 1760, when the French landed at Carrickfergus, the citizens of Belfast undertook their own defence, and Lord Charlemont's description of what happened reads like an intelligent anticipation of the evolution of Sir Edward Carson's Volunteers.

'Abandoned by government in the hour of danger, the inhabitants of Belfast were left to their own defence, and boldly and instantly they undertook it; associations were formed, arms were purchased, uniforms were provided, officers were chosen, parades were appointed, and every diligence was exerted towards the necessary acquirement of military skill and discipline. The fire was now kindled, and rapidly spread itself. Almost at the same instant many companies were formed throughout the neighbouring counties . . . Soon the whole province was in arms . . . A spirit was raised which nothing could quell, a spirit the more formidable as it was temperate. A nation was in arms; a nation, too, naturally brave, irritated by oppression, and desperate of relief but by their own exertions, who had little to lose and everything to hope from courage and perseverance.'

Once before then in the history of Ulster—for all through the northern province held the lead of the movement—that district of Ireland witnessed the creation of an army independent of government, unauthorised by law, officered by leaders who held no commissions from the crown, and almost entirely equipped by individual self-sacrifice. But Lord Buckinghamshire was under no delusions as to the ultimate purpose to which that Volunteer army might be applied. 'Would it be 'prudent,' he asked, 'to insinuate my suspicion that the real 'object of the associations and the paraded increase of the 'independent companies is to alarm Great Britain into com-'mercial concessions?' He had heard a leader of the movement describe their action as 'a passive resistance.' Five months later the viceroy's suspicion was justified, for when the Commons adopted an address to the King in favour of

'free trade,' and that address was carried in stately procession from the Parliament House to the Lord Lieutenant at the Castle, the streets of Dublin were significantly lined by the Volunteers. Such was Buckinghamshire's difficulty, and he wisely met it by an attitude of compromise. To disband the Volunteers was impossible, and would have been foolish so long as danger threatened from France; openly to recognise them would have been an equally false step. At first, acting on a truly Irish suggestion, an effort was made to partially legalise the movement by offering royal commissions to the officers, on the ground that if they were taken prisoners of war such documents would ensure their exchange, but when that ingenious subterfuge was scornfully rejected the viceroy accepted the situation with resignation. 'Offers of service 'from the independent companies,' he reported, 'and re-'quisitions for arms, are pressed upon me from all parts of 'the kingdom, and the mode of declining the one and refusing 'the other without offence is delicate and embarrassing.' Ultimately the situation took a farcical turn, for at length sixteen thousand stands of arms belonging to the government were apportioned for distribution among the Volunteers, largely owing to the fact, as the viceroy confessed, that 'without 'these bands the kingdom would be without police.' Nay, on the occasion of a serious riot in Dublin it was the Volunteers who restored order to the city,—a service which the modern Volunteers of Ulster may yet have to repeat.

If Lord North imagined his commercial concessions of the December of 1779 would placate the patriots, he was speedily undeceived. Increase of appetite grew with its nutriment. The French did not come, but the Volunteers remained. And Grattan and Charlemont were not slow to make the most of their advantage. 'The more distant consequences' of the Volunteer movement, the latter frankly confessed in the pages of his diary, 'were clearly seen, but every honest man saw them 'with exultation.' The resolution for free trade and the short Money Bill were regarded as merely the first-fruits. It was all very well for informers to decry the viceroy's 'weakness,' but as the commander-in-chief, Sir J. Irwine, asked, 'What 'can we do? We disapprove of all these violences, but we 'have the bayonet at our throats, and must submit.' Viewed from the standpoint of the English Cabinet, the condition of

Ireland was deplorable ; but a scapegoat was handy in the person of Buckinghamshire, and at length Lord North, angered that after all his concessions the Lord Lieutenant had not been able to repress fresh demands by the Irish Parliament, decided upon his recall. The Volunteers offered to escort the retiring viceroy from the Castle to the place of embarkation, but he had too lively a sense of humour to accept their services.

Whether they offered to line the streets for the reception of the Earl of Carlisle is not on record. His appointment had been under consideration for several months, for Lord North was an eighteenth-century prototype of the ' wait-and-see ' premier ; like his modern counterpart, he declined to believe there was any necessity for hurry in Irish affairs. Carlisle tried to stick a few pins in him by hinting at the multifarious dangers of delay, but he persisted for nearly six months in his policy of drift.

More than two years earlier the new viceroy had been sent on a pacific mission to the revolting Americans, an errand which prompted Horace Walpole to remark that Carlisle was ' very ' fit to make a treaty that will not be made ' ; but his failure in that task had not been regarded as a reason why he should not be entrusted with another of still greater difficulty. Perhaps Lord North had hopes of a different type of Lord Lieutenant. Carlisle was certainly different. Having emancipated himself from his gambling and man-about-town habits, he had developed an air of reserve which could hardly commend him to the impulsive Irish. Strangely enough, George Selwyn imagined that trait to be a valuable asset.

' Keep yourself ' (he advised), ' as you can very well do, within your intrenchments, that no one may toss your hat over the walls of the Castle. I dread to think what a wrong-headed people you are to transact business with for the next three years of your life. But I am less afraid of you, from your character, than of another, because I think that you will admit, at setting out, of no degree of familiarity from those you are not well acquainted with.'

Carlisle acted so scrupulously on that advice that even at the theatre he ' retired too much within the box ' ; yet there were times when he wished he had less reserve, though he was conscious that it was his ' great defence against stratagems and ' invasions.' If, however, he kept too much within the dignities

of his office, he possessed in William Eden a chief secretary whose 'man-mongering' gifts were equal to the management of the patriots. Nor was it long before the viceroy himself took the colour of his environment. To the Cabinet in London the Volunteers were as anathema as their modern representatives are to the coalition of 1914; consequently, when he accepted the offer of their services to meet a threatened invasion, he received a 'strong and cautionary admonition' from headquarters. His answer was prompt and firm: expecting an attack from fifteen thousand French, and not having sufficient regulars for the defence of the island, he did not hesitate a moment in accepting the services of the Volunteers; and if his conduct required an apology, he had not the 'ingenuity' to frame one. Under normal conditions such a retort would have spelt recall, but affairs were going so badly in America that the Cabinet could not venture on reprisals. Soon, too, the climax came,—the 'cursed event,' as Carlisle called it, of the surrender at Yorktown. It would seem, then, that the viceroy had been converted to the patriot camp; he was pestered so often and so insistently for new concessions, for an extension of the jurisdiction of the House of Lords, for the abrogation of Poynings' Law, etc., that what was demanded with so much vigour he began to think necessary; he had, in fact, allowed his hat to be tossed over the Castle wall. Nor was he to recover his plumes. By dint of Eden's 'man-'mongering,' and by judicious sops—'Foster is or ought to 'be firm with me, as I have given his brother a living of near '£1000 a year'—he was able to defeat awkward resolutions in the Commons; but Grattan's persistent motion for a Declaration of Rights gained increasing momentum and was pressed with more zeal than ever owing to the insecurity of Lord North's Ministry. Foreseeing the crash, he wrote to Selwyn in a somewhat contradictory vein: any 'sudden 'change,' he averred, would be repented by its authors; but on the other hand he declared that his removal at that moment would snatch him 'from the disgrace of a sinking 'reputation.' He did not, however, anticipate the exact nature of his way out. On the fall of North's Ministry and the accession of Rockingham to office, the absent viceroy was immediately deprived of one of his English honours, and as the intimation of that petty Whig revenge was read by him

in the Gazette several days before he received the official notification, he at once penned his resignation and dispatched Eden with it to London in furious haste. His recall, however, had been decided upon by the Whigs several days before his resignation arrived, for as Rockingham—also scared by Yorktown—had decided to grant Grattan his Declaration of Rights, he was determined to load Carlisle and the Tories with the odium of past refusals and make a Whig triumph of the 'present gratification.'

Eden did his best to out-manœuvre the Rockingham Ministry. To Carlisle he had confided that he would be 'much 'tempted' to 'move the repeal of 6 George I.' As events shaped themselves, that temptation proved irresistible. Hence, when the Commons met for the first time under the Rockingham régime, Eden forestalled all other business by moving for leave to bring in a Bill repealing as much of 6 George I. as prevented Ireland from making its own laws. An angry scene followed; Fox and his colleagues were enraged at being anticipated by such a generous concession to the Irish patriots; and Eden was threatened with a vote of censure for daring to call for the repeal of a British law. When he was at length persuaded to withdraw his motion, with the conviction, no doubt, that it had served his revenge, Fox posed as the injured martyr of a ministry which had 'actually held three 'or four councils' on Irish affairs and intended to immediately lay a preparatory measure before the House. But, according to a letter dispatched to Charlemont, the new ministry had designed proposing 'something short of Eden's motion' with the proviso that this should be 'the last' of Irish demands.

That theory receives support from the letters which Rockingham and Fox addressed to Charlemont, for in those epistles the Whig leaders expressed the hope that the Irish Parliament would consent to an adjournment of two or three weeks to enable the new viceroy, the Duke of Portland, to consider the situation in all its bearings. But the patriot leaders were determined to make the Whigs 'toe the line.' The meeting of Parliament had been fixed for the 16th of April; Grattan was primed with his speech beginning 'I am now to 'address a free people'; and although Charlemont was profuse in protesting his confidence in Rockingham's probity, neither he nor the popular leader would hear of a day's delay in

celebrating their triumph. In fact, they ordered Rockingham ' Full steam ahead ! '

What happened deserves to be recalled. His Grace of Portland ' toed the line ' to a day by delivering on the 16th of April a royal message in favour of a ' final adjustment ' of the ' discontents and jealousies ' which had arisen. From that text Grattan orated in his best Declaration-of-Rights style, concluding with a demand for, among other details, the abrogation of the claim of England to make laws for Ireland ; and that motion which, in the same parliament, had, two months earlier, been defeated by a majority of sixty-nine, was carried without a dissentient voice ! Thenceforward Rockingham continued ' Full steam ahead,' and ere May ended the Duke of Portland was able to report that the British Parliament had concurred in removing Ireland's ' causes of discontent.' Even Grattan was satisfied—for the moment. And to the patriots everything was for the best in the best of all possible worlds. They would prove the falsehood of the libel that Ireland was ' insatiable.' How familiar it all sounds—an anticipation of twentieth-century professions of ' settlement in full,' ' union ' of hearts,' and all the other stock-in-trade of Nationalist phraseology. For, with characteristic Irish impetuosity, Grattan proposed and carried a thank-offering of a hundred thousand golden Irish sovereigns for the equipment of twenty thousand Irish sailors to support ' British glory ' on the high seas.

But there was a Timothy Healy in the background in the person of Henry Flood. For some time that patriot, jealous of Grattan's growing popularity, had been pursuing the devious course of continuing to draw his Castle salary and occasionally opposing the government in the Commons. He also fostered the Volunteer movement by accepting a colonelcy. The patriots, however, resented his coquetting with ' the Cause,' and when he complained that he had espoused Ireland's rights years earlier he was reminded that if a man deserted his wife for seven years another might give her his protection. Soon, too, the Castle began to protest. Lord Carlisle directed him to be ' talked to ' ; he was to be reminded that decisive support was expected from a man holding a high and lucrative office under the Crown. ' Whether,' Carlisle reported, ' he is now ' meditating whether he will fling the vice-treasurership at my ' head, or force me to strip him of it (which I think I shall be

' necessitated to do), or behave as he ought, I am perfectly at a ' loss to guess.' Eventually the viceroy had to ' strip ' the patriot of his office, even though he was warned that Flood would ' do all he could to make mischief.' That gracious and grateful service, however, was to be rendered to another administration.

Typically enough, it was in connexion with the repeal of 6 George I. that Flood saw his opportunity. Grattan had defended his countrymen from the charge of being ' insatiable,' but he had forgotten his rival. Whether Flood really believed that simple repeal was an insufficient security for Ireland's freedom is open to question, for he had been consulted on the terms of Grattan's motion and had not objected to its wording ; besides, the Judges had pronounced the security ample, and had pledged themselves to interpret it in that sense in their courts. But Flood was in a desperate position. Even his dismissal from office had not re-established him as a patriot. The leadership of the Commons, too, had passed entirely into the hands of Grattan, who was now ' caressed and consulted by ' the government, and idolised by the people,' and had been awarded a grant of fifty thousand pounds in recognition of his ' patriotic ' services. To so ambitious, suspicious, and hasty-tempered a man as Flood such a set of adverse circumstances was intolerable ; and when a motion made in the Commons in favour of rewarding his services was received with impatience, he resolved upon a supreme effort to displace his rival. Hence his adoption of the doctrine that renunciation by England, and not merely simple repeal, with which Grattan had been satisfied, was absolutely necessary for the security of Irish freedom. Flood knew the patriots better than Grattan ; their hungry maw would continue to gape if suitable fruits were dangled before it ; so, trading upon the ingrained patriotic suspicion of England, he laboured at his constitutional hair-splitting until it became the burning question of the hour. In another matter, too, he took the lead against Grattan, for whereas the latter was in favour of disbanding the Volunteers and repressing the political conventions which were becoming fashionable in their ranks, Flood contended for their continuance because the conventions had been captured for his campaign.

Grattan and the repeal patriots were in a tight corner. The

renunciators had ousted them from the limelight. Charlemont, albeit he knew renunciation was 'the offspring of envy and 'disappointed ambition,' and was chagrined that what *he* thought sufficient security was rejected by the Floodites, soon veered round to the popular side, for as 'circumstances had 'changed' he thought it his duty to 'change with them.' But he had a terrible tussle with Grattan, who detested the renunciation brat 'for the sake of its parent,' much as Mr. Healy scorns the Redmondite brand of Home Rule because of its sponsor.

Circumstances, however, were kind to him. Consequent upon the re-shuffling of the Whigs occasioned by Rockingham's death, the Duke of Portland, having enjoyed the brief glory of the repeal episode, resigned the viceroyalty, and was succeeded by Earl Temple. When Temple reached Dublin in the September of 1782 Flood's agitation for absolute renunciation was at white heat; the 'poison' of his 'insinuations' had 'diffused itself through the country with more rapidity than 'even despondency could imagine'; and its author was rising 'upon the ruins of Grattan's popularity.' Temple, however, who was in the main the most wrong-headed as he was the most hot-tempered and consequential of all the viceroys of the eighteenth century, took sides with the repealers; the renunciators, he said, were unreasonable; if their demands were granted, there would be 'no end to their requisitions'; he was 'determined never to give way.' At this juncture a decision in England of Lord Mansfield changed the situation in a flash. Prior to the repeal of 6 George I. a writ of error had been sent to the King's Bench in England, and Mansfield, who professed ignorance of any statute abrogating the authority of his court, received the writ and acted upon it. Of course there was wild rejoicing in the renunciators' camp, and equally as wild anger at the Castle. 'I never saw a man more tho-'roughly enraged,' Charlemont recorded in his diary; 'for a 'long time I could not get leave to utter a word.' But when his temper had cooled a little the viceroy realised that Mansfield's 'cursed writ of error' was a blessing in disguise, for it gave an excuse to demand a 'satisfactory explanation on the 'part of England.' And now he became as clamorous for renunciation as Flood himself; the Cabinet 'must meet 'and must engage in a full and adequate recognition'; the matter involved his 'honour'; if his demand was not met

he would resign, and his departure would 'throw the kingdom 'into revolt.' To his brother in London he sent a draft of a Bill which the Cabinet 'must' adopt on peril of his resignation if the slightest change was made in its terms. The Bill, however, was modified; and Temple did not resign; for he was only painted to look like iron.

Nevertheless he had in his nature a vein of obstinacy in matters which concerned his worldly interests. When he realised that the Shelburne Ministry was doomed, and had a prevision of the unholy alliance between Fox and North, he declared his intention of following the star of Pitt. From that decision he never wavered; consequently, as soon as the Fox-cum-North combination was announced, he did resign in favour of the Earl of Northington.

Fox was responsible for the nomination of the new viceroy. But, as Charlemont remarked, Northington was 'better 'fitted to preside at table than in the Cabinet.' Fox was not ignorant of the fact; hence his exhortation to Northington to be 'firm'; advice which the new viceroy countered by admonishing his friend that it was a grave error to transform a gentleman 'taken wild from Brooks's' into a Lord Lieutenant. Fortune, however, was kind to him. Before the meeting of Parliament it seemed probable that his administration would be overwhelmed with disaster as soon as the session began. 'I have seen Northington,' wrote an observer from Dublin 'such a hustled head I never saw.' That was not surprising. The Volunteers, who by this time, at the instigation of Flood, were increasing in political as they were declining in military ardour, had met in convention at Dungannon and adopted a series of stringent resolutions in favour of Parliamentary reform. They had, in fact, framed a system of measures for the session, 'to be forced upon Parliament by the sword, and upon the 'Crown by a six months' Money Bill'—explanation enough of Northington's 'hustled head.' But Grattan was to be his salvation. That patriot had neither forgotten nor forgiven. The 'Cause' was a secondary consideration to revenge. Wroth with Flood for his efforts to supplant him in his patriotic leadership, sore over his defeat in the matter of repeal *versus* renunciation, and resentful at the decline of his popularity, he practically transferred his services and following to the Castle interests. Hence that furious onslaught on Flood which anticipated the amenities of Committee-room No. 15; and when,

as the result of the encounter, an armed mob surrounded his house and threatened his life, he, although giving lip service to the Volunteer demands for Parliamentary reform, saw a further opportunity of aiming a blow at his rival, and did not hesitate to support the government in declaring that the Commons would maintain their rights against all encroachments. That was the chief triumph of Northington's administration; he was able to be 'firm' because the patriots were at enmity, and the sudden collapse of the Fox-North coalition rescued him from any further attacks of 'hustled head.'

Personal friendship was the deciding factor in the appointment of Northington's successor, for William Pitt, to whom the Duke of Rutland owed his viceroyalty, was naturally attached to the patron through whom he secured his first seat n the House of Commons. The fourth Duke of Rutland has been described as having no particular talent save for 'con-'viviality'; but the archives of Belvoir Castle contradict such a hasty and ill-informed generalisation. Apart from his significant prophecy that 'without an union Ireland will not 'be connected with Great Britain twenty years longer,' his official and private letters are notable not merely for their anticipation of the trend of events but also for genuine statesmanship. He kept a sharp eye on the Bishop of Derry, who was manœuvring for the command of the Volunteers with a view to leading a rebellion; he divined to a nicety the price of support for his measures; his prophecy that the Cabinet would give a 'firm and decided opposition' to patriotic resolutions was fulfilled to the letter; and he acted with alacrity and vigour when the Dublin mob got out of hand. Towards the Volunteers he adopted a decided attitude from the first. As peace had been concluded with France, the reason for their existence had ceased; yet, owing to the instigation of Flood, they manifested neither any disposition to disband nor any desire to relax their political activity. Their continued existence was a menace to the Parliament and the public peace; 'the people are at rest,' Rutland reported, 'with arms in their 'hands; and until they are either deprived of those arms or 'hold them by a legal commission under the Crown, certain 'and permanent tranquillity will never be established.' His solution of the difficulty was the creation of a Militia plus a measure making it illegal to wear uniforms and carry arms without the licence of the government.

Such a law he would undoubtedly have carried had it not been for the failure of the Commercial Propositions business. From the outset of his negotiations with Pitt, the viceroy warned the English minister that if in his efforts to make a 'final adjustment' of the commercial relations of the two countries he insisted, as he proposed, upon demanding a stipulated contribution from Ireland towards the expenses of the Empire, the attempt would end in failure. 'The notion of 'a paltry revenue lost America,' Rutland warned his friend; if he sincerely desired a lasting commercial union, he would be 'defeated at the first mention of a compensation'; the suggestion of a contribution to England would be a 'motive 'of common interest' to unite all parties in opposition; and although personally he subscribed to the doctrine that Ireland should participate with Great Britain in expense as well as advantage, he had sadly to admit that 'the task of satisfying 'this country is a very precarious business.' All Rutland's forebodings were realised; and when the ten propositions which he engineered through the Irish Parliament were amplified into twenty in England, with clauses which restricted Ireland from the East India trade and made it compulsory for her navigation laws to conform to those of the sister kingdom, the scheme which was to have been a bridge 'from Holyhead 'to Dublin' came to utter shipwreck.

In other matters, too, and despite his personal friendship, the viceroy withstood Pitt in a manner for which he has never received credit. Once he opposed the powerful minister because he wished him to introduce an important Bill at the close of the session; on another occasion he insisted that his peerage recommendations should take effect consonant with the 'strict observance of faith' upon which he prided himself. In fact the Duke of Rutland made the nearest approach to the Chesterfield example.

Of the remaining Irish viceroys prior to the Union, two were put to a severe test. Earl Temple, who had become Marquis of Buckingham, was appointed on the sudden death of the Duke of Rutland, and had to bear the full force of the storm which arose in connexion with the Regency agitation of 1788–9. The mental affliction of George III., bringing the kingdom face to face with a condition for which there was no precedent, created in Ireland as perplexing a situation as in England. The viceroy was utterly bewildered; his lengthy and frequent

letters to his brother reflect a hundred diverse moods; yet from the beginning of his difficulties he decided to shape his conduct by one rule: 'My only object,' he frankly confessed, 'is the continuance of Mr. Pitt's power'; he would 'abide by 'him and his situation whatever it may be,' for he realised that after all it was a 'personal struggle between Mr. Pitt and Mr. 'Fox.' Such candour was unique; for there can be no question now that the impelling motive of the contending parties was not so much respect for constitutional law as a lively regard for political expediency and advantage. Pitt's policy was inevitably coloured by the assurance that the Prince of Wales would dismiss him from office, just as Fox's violation of Whig principles was due to his prospect of forming a ministry. That, too, was the deciding factor in Ireland; although Grattan declaimed in lofty style that 'Ireland waits not for a model 'whereby to frame her proceedings,' he would undoubtedly have granted Fox the respite he was not willing to accord Pitt. It was a hair-splitting business, no doubt, to decide whether a Regent should be appointed by Address or Bill, but it made all the difference to the position of the viceroy, who expected to be 'thrown into the Liffey' for adopting Pitt's policy. On the sudden recovery of the King he was as 'wild 'with satisfaction' as he had been furious with 'the rats' who had opposed him; and he looked forward with malignant delight to visiting condign punishment on all his foes. In that campaign of revenge, however, he was checkmated by instructions from London, a disappointment rendered all the more poignant by the King's indifference to the 'martyrdom' he had suffered for his sake.

Still more perturbed was the brief administration of Earl Fitzwilliam, one of the 'old Whigs' who had joined Pitt to strengthen his ministry against the excesses of the French Revolution. There was no purpose whatever in superseding the Earl of Westmorland unless Pitt had been, for the moment, sincere in his determination to grant a large measure of Catholic emancipation. True, it has been denied that Pitt had any such intention; but the testimony of private letters is against him. It was well known that Fitzwilliam favoured the claims of the Catholics; and after Grattan, who had taken the lead of the emancipation movement, had interviewed Pitt in London, the conviction of all who were behind the scenes was that Fitzwilliam would not have accepted the viceroyalty unless

he had a free hand to meet the Catholics if their claims were pressed. They were pressed, and that leave was given for the introduction of a Bill to remove their disabilities is usually cited as the reason for the viceroy's sudden recall. That may have been a factor with Pitt when he realised George III.'s fixed determination against emancipation ; but a more potent cause for Fitzwilliam's disgrace has been hitherto unknown. Soon after his arrival in Dublin he dismissed from their offices several of Buckingham's Regency supporters and intimated his intention of promoting two or three of his opponents. The late viceroy flamed into anger. Such measures were a slur on his administration ; he immediately called upon Pitt to disavow them. And he made himself so disagreeable to Pitt and his own brother that the dismissed officials were reinstated and Fitzwilliam recalled.

Coalition governments, in short, generally made a muddle of Irish affairs,—the inevitable penalty of a Cabinet gravelled for a majority. But that is by no means the only or the most significant moral writ large in the secret history of the viceroyalties of the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Even after the repeal of 6 George I., when Ireland enjoyed Home Rule and was, as Grattan declared, 'a free people' and 'as 'free as England at any period,' there was no diminution of the old triune spirit of corruption, rapacity, and instability. Chesterfield had rebuked his Irish friends for their passion for 'jobs,' and forty years later the Duke of Rutland asserted : 'Here everything is a job, and abused, with a few exceptions, 'from the highest to the lowest ; the whole people are an 'interested, selfish, savage race of harpies and plunderers.' Their rapacity was unlimited ; even Grattan rebuked Flood for fostering 'perpetual discontent,' while Burke complained that England had 'poured in almost all the oil in her stores' to assuage the eternal ferment of his native land. The instability, too, of the Home Rule Parliament was ludicrous : it had no more fixity of purpose than a weathercock, for measures of the first importance were often passed and then cancelled in the same session. In fine, as Lord Charlemont confessed, 'the 'mask of patriotism was too often assumed to disguise self-'interest and ambition, and the paths of violent opposition were 'too frequently trod as the nearest and surest road to office and 'emolument.' And that was the verdict of a patriot !

HENRY C. SHELLEY.

THE PROSE AND POETRY OF GIOSUE CARDUCCI

1. **Opere di G. Carducci.** 20 vols. Bologna: Zanichelli. 1889–1909.
2. **Lettere di G. Carducci.** 2 vols. Bologna: Zanichelli. 1911 and 1914.
3. **Memorie della vita di Giosue Carducci raccolte da un amico.** By G. CHIARINI. 2nd ed. Florence: Barbèra. 1907.
4. **La Critica.** Articles by Prof. BENEDETTO CROCE. Vols. I. and VIII. Bari.
5. **Giosue Carducci. L'Homme et le Poète.** By A. JEANROY. Paris: Honoré Champion. 1911.
6. **Carducci.** A selection of his Poems, with Verse Translations, Notes, and three Introductory Essays. By G. L. BICKERSTETH. Longmans. 1913.

THE ignorance of foreign literature in England is, perhaps, not greater than that with which Carducci so frequently taxed his own countrymen, but it is certainly a matter of regret that the intercourse of ideas between England and Italy, so lively during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, has now almost flickered out. Regarding Italian literature as a whole since the day of Leopardi and Manzoni, we may justly conclude that Italy's loss has probably been greater than our own. Nevertheless it is a heavy item on the adverse side of our account that we have up to now entirely failed to appreciate the poetic genius who illuminated in Italy the last half of the nineteenth century. Possibly we shall never do so. The deliberately classical form and the intensely national spirit of so much of Carducci's finest poetry, added to the almost insuperable difficulty of successful translation in verse, may hinder the appreciation even of his purely lyrical poems by all but the few who regularly read Italian. Yet the publication of Mr. Bickersteth's excellent book is a sign of hope. His essays on the life, the work, and the metres of Carducci judiciously blend enthusiasm and just criticism, his notes are admirable, and he prints the text of seventy chosen poems opposite his own very accurate translations in verse. Mr.

Bickersteth's aim has been to introduce Carducci to English readers, and, if possible, to tempt them to a study of the original Italian. The task could not have been better performed, and it may be confidently predicted that its object will not be entirely unfulfilled. Nevertheless, it would have been preferable if Mr. Bickersteth had been content with rhythmical prose for his translations, for the comparison of his verse with the perfection of Carducci is often unbearable. Only a great poet could translate Carducci satisfactorily, as Carducci himself translated the equally difficult Heine.

Giosue Carducci was above all things a great poet: poetry was for him, as he wrote in one of his letters, 'the art of the 'gods,' in the contemplation of which he would live and die. It was the poet who won the universal reverence of his countrymen during his later years, and it is the poet to whom M. Jeanroy and Mr. Bickersteth have dedicated their admirable studies. Yet the poet had other activities, like so many of his great predecessors in a country which, as he pointed out himself, has seldom tolerated the ἀοιδός, the mere bard. Italy's poets have been scholars, philologists, philosophers, historians, and Carducci combined something of all these qualities. He was a professor of literature at Bologna for forty-four years, an editor of Italian classics, a critic, both textual and literary, an historian of literature, a controversialist, and, to some extent, an orator. For many years he was secretary to the Deputazione di Storia Patria per le provincie di Romagna, he worked hard as a member of the Consiglio Superiore per l'Instruzione, and in 1891 he became a member of the Senate. To these activities is due the greater part of the twenty volumes that contain his work: three alone of these are devoted to poetry, while in the remaining seventeen is collected all that he wrote in prose, down to the most fugitive reviews and letters of thanks to literary societies. Even if the three volumes entitled 'Ceneri e Faville,' which hold the rather trivial residue, be disregarded, more than enough remains to have ensured Carducci celebrity as a master of prose, had he not been so great a poet. The prose of D'Annunzio, the only successor of Carducci on whom the stamp of supreme poetic genius unmistakably rests, is perhaps better known among us than his poetry: Carducci's poetry, if not well known, has at least been recognised and publicly discussed

in this country; his prose never. It is worth while, therefore, especially since Carducci the poet was discussed in the EDINBURGH REVIEW five years ago, to dwell first upon the splendour of his literary studies, the eloquence of his discourses, and the fiery humour of his polemical essays.

Professor Benedetto Croce admirably summarised Carducci's work as a man of letters, when he wrote in 'La Critica':

'It would be superfluous now to sing the praises of the loving, assiduous, fruitful labour devoted by Carducci to Italian literary history. Whosoever undertakes to study the facts and problems of that history comes upon Carducci at every step; and, profiting by his labours, is forced to pay him homage all the more sincere, and to feel a gratitude all the more lively, in that he cannot forget what a man and what a poet was he who, where it was necessary, could make himself a humble labourer. To him we owe excellent editions of the classics and the publication of important texts hitherto unpublished; to him the first serious studies upon the old popular poetry of Italy, studies upon the troubadours of Italy or in relation to Italy, a magnificent commentary on Petrarch. . . . He travelled from one end to the other of Italian literature, and left everywhere traces of his devotion and his insight.'

A reader of Carducci's prose receives, apart from all other literary interest or æsthetic pleasure, a complete course of Italian literature given by a master of exposition, whose intense devotion had woven the poetry of Italy into his inmost fibres. In his five lectures, 'Dello Svolgimento della Letteratura 'Nazionale,' with their penetrating historic vision, their eloquence, and the indelible splendour of their images, a magnificent foundation is laid; and the work is carried on by the two other lectures, 'Del Rinnovamento Letterario in Italia' and 'Di alcune condizioni della presente Letteratura.' To complete and adorn this main structure, there are essays upon the old popular poetry, lives of famous troubadours, commentaries on Dante's 'Rime' and 'Canzoni,' on Petrarch, on Politian's Italian poetry, on Parini's satires, special studies on Ariosto and Tasso, brilliant sketches of Lorenzo de' Medici, Salvator Rosa, Alfieri, and Giusti, and finally, the controversial writings in which so often he extols Monti, Foscolo, and Leopardi at the expense of Manzoni's followers, Prati, Zanella, and Aleardi, tilting at that sentimental romanticism, his chief literary bugbear, which he attributed to the influence of Manzoni. His chief merits as a teacher, besides his enthusiasm

and inspiring personality, were clearness of exposition and abundance of illustration, based upon indefatigable research and animated by a profound conviction of the importance of letters. In one sense of the word he was not a great critic, as Professor Croce pointed out in the article above quoted. Not only did his passionate views on politics and religion lead him into injustice, but he was temperamentally incapable of minute analysis. With his vivid historical imagination he could describe magnificently, but he could not dissect. His violent, enthusiastic nature deliberately rejected æsthetic philosophy: to him it was anathema, for, justly irritated by the fatuities of many ignorant critics who contributed to the newspapers assured judgments based upon superficial knowledge, he came to the conclusion that this absolute criticism with its *a priori* judgments and nebulous categories, was the ruin of modern literature, a snare to attract young men away from fruitful and necessary studies. In his satirical description of types of modern critics, which occurs in the brilliant self-defence entitled 'Critica ed Arte,' Carducci gives his own view of literary criticism thus:

'La critica letteraria, del resto, ai giorni nostri non può né deve consistere in altro che nell'applicare a un fatto nuovo, o ad una serie di fatti apparentemente nuovi, l'osservazione storica ed estetica, individuale a ogni modo e relativa, ma che pure acquista valore da chi la faccia e dal fondamento che ella abbia in una lunga e razionale esperienza di esami e raffronti tra più fatti consimili e diversi in tempi, in luoghi, in condizioni consimili e diverse.'

To him, therefore, the historian, the erudite scholar, and the comparative philologist were the best critics, and their judgments were inevitably right. It is an incomplete and erroneous view, but it shows Carducci's own aim as a man of letters, and explains the solid qualities of his three great commentaries on Politian, Petrarch, and Parini, with their exhaustive bibliographies and scholarly textual criticism, and the thoroughness with which he examined the origins of Italian literature in an age when research and painstaking study were almost non-existent in Italy.

If the excellence of Carducci's work as a professor and man of letters rested solely on his erudition, it might have been left, like Leopardi's 'Pensieri,' to be discovered by the student: what makes its interest compelling is the magnificence and

purity of his style. It is founded, as he said himself, upon the pure Tuscan speech, which he is never tired of praising and which he imbibed during his childhood in the Tuscan Maremma—the 'favella toscana' in which his grandmother told her fairy tales

> 'co'l mesto accento
> De la Versilia che nel cor mi sta
> Come da un sirventese del trecento
> Piena di forza e di soavità.'

Carducci deliberately wrought this naturally pure speech into a literary instrument by a study of the *trecentisti*, whose manner in his student days he carefully compared with the spoken language and the bad prose of the eighteenth century. He then read many of the best French authors, and translated continually from the Latin. He studied and re-studied Foscolo, Giordani, Leopardi, and Tommaseo, and finally absorbed the brilliant writers of the *cinquecento*. He always aimed, as he says, at forming clear judgments in his reading :

> 'Sentire, del resto, volli sempre a modo mio ; e il sentimento curai esprimere con la più decente schiettezza, intiero ed integro, qual mi si era formato dentro, il pensiero, non dimezzato e a un di presso e, per poltroneria o impotenza o paura, di profilo . . . Ora, leggo i dizionari.'

This was his ideal, to express with exactness, both in his prose and in his poetry, and to this end he laboured to acquire a full palette and a ready brush. His prose, above all, not only for its rhythm and its music, but for the immediateness of the poetic vision that its plastic qualities express, is the prose of a poet. It is curious, therefore, to compare it with the prose of D'Annunzio, who acquired his immense technique for purposes of the same kind. There is no question that D'Annunzio has read his dictionary with the greater effect. His inexhaustible variety reduces Carducci's vocabulary to very ordinary dimensions by comparison ; in subtle effects of harmony, in bold massing of colour, in all that composes sensual attractiveness, he is infinitely the greater master. Yet, whereas in D'Annunzio one feels the continual effort to suggest in luxuriant language a phantasm but vaguely apprehended in a chaotic consciousness, in Carducci there is only to be found the absolute certainty of a lucid vision, vividly apprehended, perfectly expressed. It is the difference between

Beethoven and Wagner. Neither Beethoven nor Carducci, though both can be bold and striking, is ever redundant or confused, because their inward eye is unclouded; their music flows with the eloquence of restraint, like a mighty stream between its banks. Wagner and D'Annunzio compose in the very agony of straining to grasp a beatific revelation, their music bursting forth like the fall of a pent-up torrent over rocks, amid an iridescent aura of intangible spray. The two methods are dictated by different temperaments, and in both there is grandeur. To grope, now despairingly, now triumphantly upon the limits of human consciousness, to grapple with the complicated psychology of modern humanity, was alien to Carducci's nature. In his poetry and his prose alike he turned his glances to the nobility of the past, and what he saw there, that he wrote down as a lesson, an encouragement or a consolation in the present.

It has been said, and, probably, still more frequently felt, that in those great historical odes, where Carducci sweeps his glance, like a searchlight at sea, over the past of Italy, there is evident a certain effort to assimilate poetically a hard nucleus of erudition, which clouds the spontaneous beauty of other passages. There is truth in this criticism, though it has been overstated by certain Italian critics. But of Carducci's prose, at all events, it can only be said that when the poet's eye is turned backwards to the rise and florescence of Italian greatness and Italian literature it takes its most splendid flights. Unhampered by the need for brevity, as in an ode, he could mass the erudite details by themselves, and in his commentary soar untrammelled. Throughout his work Carducci's inspiration is, in the main, historical, and yearningly as he evoked the classic age of Greece, passionately as he thrilled to the Revolution and the heroism of Garibaldi, no period of history so inflamed his soul as that between the twelfth and sixteenth centuries, when the Italian people, slowly realising their strength, repulsed the Swabian emperor, towered above the Papacy, and enjoyed their brief Periclean age of prosperity and independence; when Lorenzo's Florence was resplendent, when the great jurists of Bologna drew all Europe to their lectures, when Venice 'held the gorgeous East in fee,' and the magnificence of Ferrara was unsurpassed. Moreover, this new day of splendour and power, which dawned so quickly

after the previous darkness, was the great age of Italian literature. Thus it is that so many passages in Carducci's literary studies have all the proud thrill of stanzas from the 'Odi Barbare.' In his essays and lectures, in the two great orations on the 'Studio di Bologna' and 'La Libertà Per-'petua di San Marino,' and in the commemorative discourses on Petrarch and Boccaccio he has richly displayed the lofty spirit penetrated by the contemplation of past glories that animates not only the great odes of his later period but even the violence of his 'Giambi ed Epodi,' and the outburst 'A Satana.'

To understand Carducci's attitude as a poet it is indispensable, above all, to read the five discourses 'Dello Svolgimento della 'Letteratura Nazionale,' which, like the ode to the Clitumnus among the poems, contain every side of his genius, except his violent temper, every source of his inspiration, except the influence of Heine. Their official date is 1868-1871, but they are the matured product of his earliest courses at Bologna, and certain passages were contained in his learned introduction to the poems of Politian, published in 1863. The note is struck at once in the first words of the first lecture. Without any timid bars of introduction the poet strikes one sweeping chord upon his lyre, and launches out:

'V'immaginate il levar del sole nel primo giorno dell' anno mille?'

He pictures the expected terrors of the millennium, the trembling anticipation of the dire portents prophesied by St. John, suddenly swept away by that dawn.

'Che stupore di gioia e che grido salí al cielo dalle turbe raccolte in gruppi silenziosi intorno a' manieri feudali, accasciate e singhiozzanti nelle chiese tenebrose e ne' chiostri, sparse con pallidi volti e sommessi mormorii per le piazze e alla campagna, quando il sole, eterno fonte di vita, si levò trionfale la mattina dell'anno mille! Folgoravano ancora sotto i suoi raggi le neve delle Alpi, ancora tremolavano commosse le onde del Tirreno e dell' Adriatico, superbi correvano dalle rocce alpestri per le pingui pianure i fiumi patrii, si tingevano di rosa al raggio matutino cosí i ruderi neri del Campidoglio e del Foro come le cupole azzurre delle basiliche di Maria. Il sole! Il sole! V'è dunque ancora una patria? V'è il mondo? E l'Italia distendeva le membra raggricciate dal gelo della notte, e toglieasi d'intorno al capo il velo dell'ascetismo per guardare all'oriente.'

Then, rapidly sketching the general history of Italy for the next two hundred years—a sketch which he filled in later with his splendid discourse on Italy in the fourth Crusade, and his memoirs of the two troubadours, Bernart de Ventadorn and Rambaud de Vaqueiras—he passes on to a brilliant analysis of the three great influences of the age : the Christian Church, the feudal chivalry, and the growing power of the commercial guilds, in which last he finds the continuation of the old Roman, the truly national, tradition of Italy. His discussion of the ecclesiastical spirit, in particular, is reminiscent of many of his poems, of 'Satana,' the early hymn 'A Febo Apolline,' 'Alle Fonti del Clitumno,' and 'In Una Chiesa Gotica.' While allowing its salutary inhibition of barbarism and its assistance in forming the popular tongue, he inveighs against its ascetic ideal and its prescription of beauty as a snare of the devil. From his artistic point of view Carducci was fanatically opposed to Christianity, and often unwarrantably violent in his attacks; but it must be admitted that he had a great many facts of history to support his view that the Papacy systematically opposed art and progress.

The second lecture deals with the formation of the literary language in the century of struggle and preparation that preceded the glories of the *trecento*. The age of chivalry is past, and with the triumph of the Church the mystic element in art reigns all supreme :

'E in cima alla Somma di Tommaso d'Aquino la teologia s'abbraccia con la scienza; e in cima alla ontologia di Bonaventura la fide s'abbraccia con l'arte; a tutte quattro paion d'alto irraggiare le belle cattedrali sorgenti nell'Italia di mezzo e i timidi colori dell'arte che aspetta Giotto. Dante sta ritto in piedi tra i colonnati solenni e leggiadri, e guarda, rapito in contemplazione.'

This wonderful piece of sculpture in words leads to the third lecture on the great Tuscan period, where, with all the pride of a Tuscan poet, he dilates on the splendour of Florence, which he compares to Athens after Marathon because, with all its vivid reality of life, there was still in its heart 'quel quasi senso 'fanciullesco d'un'arte nuova.' It is the *trecento*, the age of Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio. Dante embodies the last great moment when the two streams of Italian art and the ecclesiastical spirit flowed together. After the 'Divina Commedia'

they parted, and Dante left no successors. As the poet perfectly expresses his view, Dante

'discese da paradiso portando seco le chiavi dell'altro mondo, e le gittò nell'abisso del passato : niuno le ha più ritrovate.'

But it is impossible to pursue the argument in detail, through Petrarch and Boccaccio, through the new humanistic ardour of the *quattrocento* to the unparalleled blossoming of all the arts that was the Renaissance. The same high lyric note is held throughout, sonorous without being forced ; the power and clarity of poetic vision never degenerate into vague fantasy, and the splendid diction never becomes empty rhetoric. With the inevitability of a great artist Carducci seizes the pictorial moment, and there is, perhaps, no more splendid example of his unversified 'Odi Barbare' than the passage which fixes for ever in the memory the revival of classical learning, when Italian scholars, with fervent enthusiasm, braved every hardship in the pursuit of precious manuscripts.

'Ed ecco: per un Petrarca che andava frugando le città dei barbari in cerca di qualche opera obliata di Cicerone ; per un Boccaccio che saliva trepidante di gioia nella biblioteca di Montecassino tra l'erba cresciuta grande sul pavimento, mentre il vento soffiava libero per le finestre scassinate e le porte lasciate senza serrami, scotendo la polvere da lunghi anni ammontata su'volumi immortali . . . ecco sorgere le diecine di questi devoti dell' antichità, affrontando pericoli di lunghi viaggi, passando monti e mari, peregrinando poveri e soli per contrade inospitali, tra popoli o avversi o sospettosi, de'quali non sapevan la lingua, tra tedeschi, tra turchi. Andavano, dicevan essi, a liberare i gloriosi padri " dagli ergastoli dei germani e dei galli." E i baroni dei torrazzi del castello e i servi della gleba per avventura ridevano al veder passare quegl'italiani magri, sparuti, con lo sguardo fisso, con l'aria trasognata, e salire affannosi le scale ruinate di qualche abbazia gotica, e scenderne raggianti con un codice sotto il braccio : ridevano, e non sapevano che da quel codice era per uscire la parola e la libertà, che dovea radere al suolo quelle torri e spezzare quelle catene . . .'

Spezzare quelle catene : here is the true Carduccian touch. With the idea of illustrating a definite moment of artistic development, he paints a picture that has its own intrinsic æsthetic value ; but this æsthetic value brings up in its turn the historic or moral value of the thing represented, considered always from the standpoint of an Italian patriot. He leads

his hearers intentionally through the successive mental responses 'How interesting! how beautiful! how fortunate 'Italy, when these things could be!' With all the bravely pagan appreciation of plastic beauty which he so proudly opposes to modern sentimentalism, Carducci does not regard the past as a flowery field for merely æsthetic promenades. In this he is sharply divided from the French Romantics and from D'Annunzio, who is himself steeped in history. D'Annunzio, like Victor Hugo and Théophile Gautier, sees in the Middle Ages a riot of colour, an orgy of vigorous temperament: in certain passages of 'Le Vergini delle Rocce,' in many of Stelio Effrena's speeches in 'Il Fuoco,' in the 'Vita di Cola da Rienzo,' the poet is concerned with nothing but the jewels and the gay silks, the gigantic meals, the gorgeous drinking-bouts, the clash of arms and personalities, the zest of life, the rich frequency of violent death. Carducci scorns the æsthetic adventure. Seer rather than lyric poet, through all the outward show he ever contemplates the greatness of Italy.

There is another side to Carducci's prose. It illustrates the more transient and mortal elements of Carducci's genius, but these elements cannot be overlooked, particularly as their artistic expression is often extremely attractive, Carducci was a seer, but he was also, in his younger days, a rabid Garibaldian: he was strongly opposed to the literary tendencies of his time, and proclaimed his opposition with all the rugged fury of his irritable nature. His polemical prose is considerable in quantity, and falls within his most brilliant period, 1871–1885, with a break of four years after 1874. From a purely literary point of view much of it is now unimportant, except that his defence of his own poetry against certain stupid and malignant critics supplies a valuable commentary on not only his own work but the literary state of Italy. One cannot help regretting, too, the unnecessary heat of his controversies, such as the one with Rapisardi. Nevertheless, in the chief of the polemical writings are to be found passages of charming reminiscence, of acute literary criticism, and of mordant wit, which are among the most brilliant pages ever written by Carducci. No reader will easily forget the delightful recollections of his childhood that begin the essay on Manzoni, nor the joyousness of 'Le Risorse di San Miniato al Tedesco,'

nor the spirited analysis of his youthful ideals and development in ' Raccoglimenti ' with its proud repudiation of popular favour, nor his bitter words on the dishonour of Italy in the preface to ' Giambi ed Epodi,' nor his satire on Italian delusions after 1860 in ' Levia Gravia,' nor the picture in the ' Manzoni ' of Italy, so careless of her own true glories, indulging in a fit of literary chauvinism :

' E, come spettacolo, è curiosamente bello vedere la grande piagnona e la grande baccante, o velata a bruno o vestita a festa superbamente, ululare su l'ultima tomba o saltare intorno l'ara più recente, facendo a un tempo dell'una mano quel che Dante chiamava le *fiche* alle altre tombe e alle altre are, e dell'altra mano le corna verso oltre monte e oltre mare . . .'

In these passages the influence of Heine is obvious. It is possible to regret this influence as excessive upon Carducci's poetry, which in its essential inspiration was not in the least Heinesque ; but in these lively passages of prose it is a sheer joy. Carducci does not slavishly imitate, he merely applies Heine's method to his own burst of indignation, with the same deceptive simplicity of language, the same felicity of phrase, the same unexpected sting in the tails of what appear to be poetic similes, the same ironic scorn for Philistines, cowards and self-seekers, the same intimate and tender regard for natural beauty. The mocking spirit of the ' Reisebilder ' breathes through the amusing picture of an official festivity in ' Il Secondo centenario di Muratori,' in the whimsicality of ' Le Risorse di San Miniato,' in the biting pages of ' Critica ed ' Arte ' where Carducci holds up to ridicule the types of literary critics, and, above all, through ' Ça Ira,' that unnecessarily long defence of his sonnet-sequence on France in 1792. The fourth and seventh chapters of ' Ça Ira ' are particularly brilliant examples of biting humour blended with poetic eloquence. Carducci hated what he called the *descrittori*, but here are two prose landscapes, evidently written with gusto, and the second ends with an apostrophe to the washerwomen of Lake Garda, which as an expression of humorous discontent is better than the ' Intermezzo ' itself.

Carducci had formed his serious prose style by the age of twenty-eight, as the introduction to the Politian shows ; he had longer to wait for his complete poetic development, though he wrote poetry continuously from the age of fifteen.

Few poems published before 1873, when Carducci was thirty-eight, are included either in Mr. Bickersteth's selection or in the 'Antologia Carducciana' of Mazzoni and Picciola; and it is quite clear to any reader of the complete poems—which are published separately in one beautifully printed volume by the firm of Zanichelli—that in the 'Juvenilia,' 'Levia 'Gravia,' and even in the 'Giambi ed Epodi,' Carducci was still groping his way to maturity. In the chronology of his work—which, though it was intentionally confused by Carducci in the official edition, has been carefully studied by M. Jeanroy—the year of the 'Nuove Poesie,' 1873, is a very important date. This volume contained many of his most justly celebrated poems, the magnificent sonnets 'Il Bove' and 'Qui 'Regna Amore' and the 'Primavere Elleniche'; from it dates his European reputation. The next sixteen years were those of his happiest inspiration, for they saw the three books of the 'Odi Barbare' and the 'Rime Nuove.' Carducci composed poetry for another ten years, but though the 'Rime 'e Ritmi,' collected in 1899, contains the great historical odes 'Piemonte,' 'Cadore,' 'Alla Città di Ferrara,' and 'La Chiesa di Polenta,' it must be admitted that Professor Croce speaks the truth when he says that, in spite of occasional bursts of pure lyrism and a consistently lofty conception, Carducci was in this period reduced to imitating himself and had formed a manner that was almost a recipe.

In a criticism of Giovanni Prati, Carducci recommended that a *libro d'oro* of his best work should be published. It is only with the *libro d'oro* of Carducci that an English reader need be concerned, if he reads as an amateur—in the proper sense of that word. In Professor Croce's view there is a nucleus of poetry in Carducci's work that defies all criticism; that, he says, is all that can be asked of a poet. It is interesting, nevertheless, to observe in passing the early developments which stand well outside that nucleus. Carducci's inspiration was at first purely literary. His youthful sonnets, odes, *canzoni*, and blank verse are palpable imitations of Dante, Petrarch, Foscolo, and Leopardi. They are almost wholly devoid of originality and spontaneity, yet they show a remarkable sense of beauty, a ripe appreciation of form, and a promising aptitude for poetic imagery. They contain, too, in embryo all the individual qualities of his later poetry, the vigorous

outlook on life, the pagan ideal of beauty, the rejection of sentimentalism, the sense of epic greatness in the past, the patriotic enthusiasm for Italian liberty. Yet the verses written during the struggle of 1859 and 1860 show how closely the poet was enveloped in the man of letters. In the preface to the edition of poems published in 1871, Carducci, characteristically regretting his temporary identification with general political opinion, judges this phase of his work with the greatest harshness, and tells how he did penitence by wrapping himself in the winding-sheet of erudition. It was not erudition that he required, but intense feeling. This came to him in 1867, when the ignoble defeats of Custoza and Lissa and the repudiation of Garibaldi had roused him to a white-hot fury. In the violent political tirades delivered between 1867 and 1872 a wholly new Carducci appears, who flings aside all memories of Italian classics to lash Pio Nono and the opponents of Garibaldi with the scathing phrases of Victor Hugo and Barbier. Carducci was too angry to be an effective satirist, and his blind rage led him into extravagance that was both ludicrous and revolting; but this hot passion served to burst the literary envelope, and from the address 'Agli Amici 'della valle Tiberina' onwards the jet of true poetry, vivid and quick, gathered in power, as the concern with merely temporary circumstances fades away. In the odes on the deaths of Eduardo Corrazzini and Giovanni Cairoli the poet of the 'Odi Barbare' and 'Rime Nuove' is already born. Both are disfigured by excess of political animus, but the one contains these four perfect stanzas:

'Ahi lasso! ma de' tuoi monti, a l'aprico
Aer e nel chiostro ameno
Più non ti rivedrò, mio dolce amico,
Come al tempo sereno.

Per l'alpestre cammino io ti seguía;
E'l tuo fucil di certi
Colpi il silenzio ad or ad or fería
De' valloni deserti.

L'alta Roma io cantava in riva al fiume
Famoso a l'universo:
E il can latrando a le cadenti piume
Rompeva a mezzo il verso,

O a te accennando usciva impazïente
Fuor de la macchia bruna;
Or raspa su la tua fossa recente,
E piagnesi alla luna.'

In the other he pictures the mother of the Cairoli with the one remaining of her heroic sons in lines of equally compelling beauty:

'De le sue stanze pe'l deserto strano
S'incontran due viventi:
Tristi echi rende il sepolcreto vano
Sotto i lor passi lenti:

Avvalla il figlio de la madre in faccia
Il viso e gli occhi muti,
Che non rivegga in lui la cara traccia
De' suoi quattro perduti.'

Professor Croce, while protesting that no single phrase like 'classicism,' 'paganism,' or 'anti-romanticism' sums up Carducci's poetry, finds his essence in the fact that he was the 'poeta commosso della storia.' It is remarkable, he says, that Italy, when rising again as a nation to new tasks, should produce a poet impregnated with her new life who made his voice powerful with her history. Certainly Carducci's historical vision, which has already been illustrated in his prose, combined with his intense national feeling, is the chief factor in the poetry which won him such reverence in his lifetime. The splendid lyric poems with an epic march, the sonnets which stamp out with incisive purity great historic moments or personages, and the vigorous narratives like 'Sui Campi di Marengo' and the 'Canzone di Legnano,' magnificently carved on the ancient ballad form, are monuments of his particular genius which stand out from all the other poetry of Italy. There is no period of history that he does not touch. With marvellous economy of language, with a perfect blending of form and concept, he sweeps from point to point of an historic range in a superb eagle-flight. The space may be a small one, as in the twelve sonnets 'Ça Ira,' or it may be vast, as in the 'Bicocca 'di San Giacomo,' but in either case the poet gives the effect of immediate vision as well as of reflection. One of the best instances of his power is to be found in 'Alle Fonti del Clitumno,' that masterpiece which includes all the best elements of

Carducci. After describing the scene at Colle Pissignano he calls on Umbria to tell her story:

'O testimone di tre imperi, dinne
Come il grave umbro ne' duelli atroce
Cesse a l'astato velite e la forte
Etruria crebbe:

Di'come sopra le congiunte ville
Dal superato Cimino a gran passi
Calò Gradivo poi, piantando i segni
Fieri di Roma.

Ma tu placavi, indigete comune
Italo nume, i vincitori ai vinti,
E, quando tonò il punico furore
Dal Trasimeno,

Per gli antri tuoi salí grido, e la torta
Lo ripercosse buccina da i monti . . .'

The indigenous Umbrian, the Etruscan conqueror, the new conquest by Rome, peaceful settlement, the invasion of Hannibal, all are compressed into less than four stanzas, while the lines following the above quotation, which represent the call to arms against the Carthaginian that rang through the countryside, show that these are not merely a scholar's reminiscences, but a vivid mental reconstruction of the past. Yet it must be admitted that, while Carducci's thought, though condensed, is always clear, his erudite allusiveness sometimes overwhelms the lyric qualities. This is particularly evident in the great odes from 'Piemonte' onwards, which are only saved by certain beautiful passages of more direct representation, such as the pictures of Carlo Alberto in 'Piemonte' and of Calvi's heroism in 'Cadore,' or the final stanzas of 'La Chiesa di Polenta.' In his historical poems, too, Carducci was apt to forget his own favourite poetic theory that 'sol nel passato è il bello,' for his evocations are often so clearly dictated by the political feeling of his day that it is to be feared they are likely to vanish out of the living poetry of Italy when the struggles of the nineteenth century are forgotten. The magnificent 'Canzone di Legnano,' a purely objective narrative, is far less exposed to the corrosion of time than the odes in 'Rime e Ritmi'; but it will be unfortunate if another age in Italy finds no pleasure in earlier odes on the

anniversary of Rome's foundation, on the death of Garibaldi, and on the 'Scoglio di Quarto,' or in the tragic figure of Letizia Buonaparte holding out her arms to the sea:

'Sta ne la notte la corsa Niobe,
Sta su la porta donde al battesimo
Le usciano i figli, e le braccia
Fiera tendo su'l selvaggio mare:

E chiama, chiama, se da l'Americhe,
Se di Britannia, se da l'arsa Africa
Alcun di sua tragica prole
Spinto da morte le approdi in seno.'

Yet these stately odes, this magnificent reflection of the spirit of the *risorgimento*, by no means exhaust Carducci's poetical content. There are many of his poems which make the more universal appeal of art in the crystallisation of human emotions, in the apprehension of beautiful but fleeting visions, in the capture of imperishable treasures from the transient medley of earthly things. They give a perfectly sufficient answer to the judgment that Carducci was an inferior poet, lucky in finding a great national movement to waft him, as on the crest of a wave, far beyond his natural limits of attainment. Félix Arvers won immortality with a single sonnet; Carducci wrote at least six, apart from his commemorative or historical sonnets, which show a supreme mastery of the form. 'Virgilio,' 'Sole e Amore,' 'Qui Regna Amore,' and 'Funere Mersit 'Acerbo,' each with its own deep emotion, its own vision, its own perfect articulation, are masterpieces; but the greatest masterpiece of all is the celebrated 'Il Bove,' in which he sums up that feeling expressed by Dostoevsky's Father Zossima:

'Truly all things are good and fair because all is truth. Look at the horse, that great beast that is so near to man; or at the lowly, pensive ox, which feeds him and works for him; look at their faces, what meekness, what devotion to man, who often beats them mercilessly. What gentleness, what confidence, and what beauty!'

Carducci's sonnet on the 'pio bove,' whose gentle glance chides the impatient goading of man, whose eye reflects

'il divino del pian silenzio verde,'

suggests, without exclamation, the reverent emotion of genius before natural, pastoral beauty, the emotion of Virgil's 'Georgics'

and of Millet's painting. Nor is this an isolated instance of a deep feeling for nature in the poet. It is evident in the opening of 'Alle Fonti del Clitumno,' where the sunburnt Umbrian woman is suckling her child while the father, girt with goat-skin, guides the plough and the oxen 'that Virgil 'loved'; in the picture of his first love, the Tuscan Maria of 'Idillio Maremmano'; and in the wonderful alcaics of 'La 'Madre':

'Lei certo l'alba che affretta rosea
Al campo ancora grigia gli agricoli
Mirava scalza co'l piè ratto
Passar tra i roridi odor' del fieno.

Curva su i biondi solchi i larghi omeri
Udivan gli olmi bianchi di polvere
Lei stornellante su'l meriggio
Sfidar le rauche cicale a i poggi.

E quando alzava da l'opra il turgido
Petto e la bruna faccia ed i riccioli
Fulvi, i tuoi vespri, o Toscana,
Coloraro ignei le balde forme.'

In face of this radiant serenity one cannot help regarding with some resentment the influence of Heine, whom Carducci imitated with a tiresome persistency in the poetry of his middle period. Heine's spirit was a solace to him, no doubt, in his political and literary discontents; but it was not part of his true poetic soul. The 'Colloquio con gli Alberi' and the clever 'Anacreontica Romantica' appear trivial compared with 'Mors,' in which the visitation of cholera assumes the proportions of some terrific figure by Dürer, or with the brilliant *sestina* 'Notte di Maggio,' or with the colour of 'Da 'Desenzano' and 'Presso la tomba di P. B. Shelley,' or with the exquisite music, which D'Annunzio has not rivalled, of the second poem called 'Visione,'

'Il sole tardo ne l'invernale
Ciel le caligine scialbe vincea . . .'

with its decasyllables that chime like distant bells. Even in his more intimately personal poems Carducci, though he makes play with the burial of love and descries baleful monsters

lurking in the depths of his heart, shows that he is, in reality, far removed from the poignancy of Heine's:

> 'Aus meinen grossen Schmerzen
> Mach' ich die kleine Lieder.'

Love appears in Carducci's poetry neither as a divinity nor as a symbol, but simply as a sensuous enjoyment to be placed beside other pleasures, as a bassarid in Bacchus' train. His Delias, Lydias, and Lalages are not abstractions—indeed, they are too obviously flesh and blood; they are not objects of immortal passion, but instances of *bonnes fortunes*. As Carducci penitently wrote to his wife after a quarrel: 'Le altre 'sono cose fuggitive, per fantasia, per chiasso.' This explains his easy passage from the pagan ecstasies of the glittering 'Primavera Dorica' and the bacchic 'Ruit Hora' to mock-ironic regrets after Heine or the petulance of 'Alla Stazione,' where the poet describes a farewell at a railway station in alcaics that are a *tour de force* of versification. Carducci preserved his serenity in love; the passionate exhibition of a bleeding heart to the world seemed to him nothing but a morbid and decadent fashion, as he humorously proclaimed in the 'Intermezzo.' Carducci kept his 'dear heart' severely to himself, or he spoke of it with a playful smile as in the 'Idillio Maremmano' and 'Davanti San Guido.' These two beautiful poems express more sweetly than any the wistful tenderness with which he regarded the place of his childhood: their beauty, moreover, is due to a delicate personal emotion, perfectly suggested; but when the poet speaks of himself, he masks his shyness in an embarrassed irony imitated from Heine, which seems to waft into the peaceful atmosphere of the rolling Maremma, where the double row of cypresses goes down to Bolgheri, and where 'Nonna Lucia' told her fairy tale, an acrid breath that is vaguely unpleasant. Only in two poems has Carducci completely put off this shyness: in the proud ode on his daughter's marriage, when he muses on the years that have passed since he first 'beat 'on the gates of the future,' and in the short elegy, 'Pianto 'Antico,' which bears witness to the bitter tragedy of his life, the death of his three-year-old son. Here indeed is poignancy of feeling, the utter misery of personal bereavement, which compels the poet to call mankind to come and see if

there be any sorrow like unto his sorrow. Then indeed from his great grief he made a little song, yet it was in no Heinesque attitude that he threw aside his reserve: rather, he laid bare his heart, inconsolable, unconquered, with the calm despair of the Greek Anthology.

'L' albero a cui tendevi
La pargoletta mano,
Il verde melograno
Da' bei vermigli fior,

Nel muto orto solingo
Rinverdi tutto or ora,
E giugno lo ristora
Di luce e di calor.

Te fior de la mia pianta
Percossa e inaridita,
Te de l'inutil vita
Estremo unico fior,

Sei ne la terra fredda,
Sei ne la terra negra;
Né il sol più ti rallegra
Né ti risveglia amor.'

This is the real Carducci, in whose eyes all the psychological heritage of modern civilisation, from Rousseau onwards, was but a tasteless decoration obscuring the pure classical grace of poetry's temple. He took the form of his art from the great masters of Italian poetry, but the form of his thought, though it was strictly conditioned by the circumstances of his time, came from Horace and Virgil, from Homer and the Greek tragedians. Herein lies a double obstacle to his universal appreciation. Acting on his poetic theory, 'Sol nel passato è 'il bello,' he consciously broke from the development of European thought, and urged by this very antagonism and by his irredentist nationalism he reflected, as a rule, not the universe, not all mortality, but the particular state of a particular nation. Critics of a newer generation have already espied the limits of Carducci's genius. They point out that he ignored the elementary inspirations of the lyrist, such as passion and pain, that he was no philosopher, that much of his work was below the highest standard, that there is often artificiality in the erudition of his historical odes. Such

criticism is true so far as it goes. A poet reaches universality in two chief ways: either by delineating with convincing purity of line the passions of all humanity, or by rising from a particular feeling to an all-embracing conception of ultimate truth. Heine and Catullus were universal in the one way, Dante in the other, Shakespeare in both, but Carducci seldom in either. His antipathy to romantic egotism barred to him the first way, his hatred for mysticism the second. Thus admirers of Carducci cannot be indignant with his critics, since their particular judgments may be admitted while their adverse conclusions are rejected. It is, moreover, futile to insist, as a defence, on the value of Carducci's classicism in stemming an unhealthy literary tendency, or on the historic greatness of the poet who fulfilled the imperious needs of his time in reforming literary taste. The only questions to ask are whether, in spite of his historical preoccupation, his psychological shyness, and his economy of emotion, he was a true poet and whether he wrote beautiful poetry. These questions can be answered with an emphatic affirmative.

Apart from all consideration of content, Carducci was a master of form. Nowhere in all Italian poetry is greater perfection to be found, whether it be in rhyme or in the classical metres of the 'Odi Barbare.' The gusty vapourings that arose over the 'Odi Barbare' have now completely died down, and there is no need to discuss at length these reproductions of Horatian metres. Carducci solved the problem of adaptation with extraordinary completeness, and it may be suggested that this part of his work should find especial appreciation in England, where the classics still play so great a part in education. Nobody who admires Horace can withhold his admiration from the Odes of Carducci, for in both there is the same dignity, sonority, and terseness of expression. Criticism cannot say more than that all the metres are not proved equally adaptable. The sapphic, the alcaic, and the third asclepiad are perfect instruments for Tuscan verse, so is the elegiac distich; the pythiambic and archilochian metres fail. On the other hand, Carducci constructed some beautiful combinations of his own. Nothing could be more lovely than the quatrains of 'Colli 'toscani, e voi pacefiche selve d'olivi,' where three hexameters are followed by an iambic trimeter; or than the scheme of

'Presso Una Certosa,' with its two rhymed Ionics *a minore* followed by an *ottonario* and a *senario sdrucciolo* (the *ottonari* rhyming through the four stanzas).

But Carducci does not only chant the solemn music of Rome; so far as pure melody goes he can hold his own with any more sensuous poet of to-day. The 'Visione' already quoted, the 'Canto di Marzo,' 'Mattinata,' and 'Notte di Maggio' are music of the richest harmony. Carducci at his best is neither cold nor dry. He is passionate in his very archaism, and if he avoids the more primitive personal emotions, there are other emotions of pity, of patriotism, of reverence, on which he soars to a universality, neither pathetic nor philosophic, but plastic—the universality of the Parthenon or the Winged Victory. If Carducci had been an exile, wandering and persecuted, if a great passion of the heart had been his, if religion had stirred his soul, he would have written differently, more humanly, but in no case could the bitterness of bereavement have wrung from the poet's heart a more human cry than 'Pianto Antico.' It can hardly be conceived that such poetry should die, though much of Carducci's work is not at once compelling. Yet even if it should die, the poet has let us know that he viewed such a possibility serenely. Secure in the success of his struggle with the present, he looked upon the future with such large hope that instead of chanting a triumphant 'Exegi monu-'mentum' he contemplated with equanimity his extinction in the splendours of posterity:

'E so che del mio lavoro poetico rimarrà a pena qualche scaglia, e solo a corredo di collezione ne' musei della storia letteraria: nè di tale dileguar mio tutto e intiero e per sempre anche nell' arte da me religiosamente venerata sento, a dir vero, dolore ed orrore; anzi, per la coscienza che ho di quello che fu e sarà grande, guardo tranquillo dall' alto della mia ragione a cotesto dissolvimento, e in cospetto all' età augurate sospiro anch' io, come l'antico santo: *Cupio dissolvi et esse cum Christo.*'

ORLO WILLIAMS.

MAGIC OR RELIGION?

The Golden Bough. By J. G. Frazer. In Seven Parts. Third edition. Macmillan. 1910–13.

TWENTY-THREE years ago a handsome pair of volumes was offered to the learned world by a scholar of the highest academic credentials. Naturally, the book was received with every mark of respect. If a serious student of the classics—one who might aspire eventually to produce a standard commentary on a text—chose to amuse himself with folklore, well and good. But that this was a revolutionary manifesto, an heretical tract for the times, no one suspected for an instant. Otherwise, in sheer self-preservation, the united body of the erudite might well have treated the author of these disturbing speculations as a backslider and an outcast.

Another school of thought, of course, there was, which might perhaps be expected to provide sanctuary for the offender. Tylor and the other anthropologists would realise that European folklore, with its corollaries bearing on the classics, was no child's play, no idle occupation of a winter's evening, but matter for sober science, something capable of being elaborately explained in terms of savages and survivals. As it was, however, official anthropology was at first inclined to stand aloof. This seemed to be literary rather than truly scientific work. The author might have rendered the spirit of our old wives' tales very nicely. But had he hobnobbed with cannibals, had he measured heads at the risk of losing his own, had he, in fact, spent a single working day outside the four walls of his study, so as to learn how to discriminate between the smell of his lamp and the genuine reek of uncultivated humanity?

Tylor's revelations in regard to the primitive mind were not, after all, excessively startling. Animism, to be sure, proved a freakish affair when carried to extremes. Yet most people believe in souls and spirits to some extent. Or again, that a sacrifice is typically a gift, or that prayer in its earliest form is just such a request as might be addressed to a great chief—all this verged on the obvious for anyone who had studied his Old

Testament. Even magic, so long as it was thought of mainly as the practice of the black art, might be set down as something which but recently filled the imagination of the educated classes of our own country, while along the countryside it still keeps the gossips busy. Altogether, the savage as he appears in the pages of 'Primitive Culture' is a rational being, *Homo sapiens*, who would have drawn his conclusions soundly enough, if only the right premises had been forthcoming. But this latest version of the primitive mind was surprising to a fault, since it made out the savage to be little better than crazy, a distressful wretch whose existence was a perpetual nightmare. It surely must have somehow got the values wrong, if it thus sought to represent superstition, taken at its most foolish and foul, not merely as the by-product of man's intellectual advance, but as the staple yield of his mental activities, his daily sustenance and support, the very staff of his life.

One anthropologist, indeed, it might seem, ought to have displayed a warmer interest in the new venture. Andrew Lang was a classical scholar, a man of letters, as well as an enthusiastic upholder of what he termed 'Mr. Tylor's Science.' Again, he was one of the most distinguished members of the Folk-lore Society, and was in a position to rate Mannhardt's discoveries in the sphere of European folk-custom at their true worth. Yet of sympathy Lang showed none. On the contrary, he laid himself out to annihilate 'the Covent Garden school of 'mythology,' as he called it, as thoroughly as he had already annihilated the school which identified mythology with a 'disease of language.' How it came about that two scholars whose interests had so much in common should fail utterly to see eye to eye—and it remained ever thus—it boots not to inquire. Suffice it to say, as regards Lang's services to anthropology, that, on the one hand, he imported into the science just what it happened to need most, namely, criticism of the most searching kind applied alike to arguments and to sources; and that, on the other hand, his gay and flippant manner of conducting a cross-examination, even if it mightily tickled the bystanders, would now and then bear somewhat hardly on his victim.

To another of his countrymen, however, who was likewise an anthropologist of the highest repute, the author of 'The 'Golden Bough' might look with the certain hope of cordial

appreciation. Robertson Smith, having fared ill at the hands of certain zealots of the North, had in the end made Cambridge his asylum. A Semitic scholar in the first instance, he had acquired in the course of editing the ninth edition of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' a just sense of the spaciousness of history—an experience of the infinite wealth of the material to which the comparative method might be fruitfully applied by the student of human culture and, in particular, of human religion. Nor did his genius lend itself any less to intensive than to extensive study. Force of industry and fineness of perception were conjoined in him; learning was tempered with insight; the orderliness of the classical temperament was matched by the fire of the romantic. Cut off, as he was soon to be, in his prime, he had already taken rank as one of the master minds of his generation. Seeing, then, that 'The 'Golden Bough' stands in closest affinity with the spirit of his pioneer work, and that its author was his personal friend, we may endorse the latter's modest claim to be his follower and disciple; not taking the admission too literally, but recognising that association with such a tower of intellectual strength must have been a source of moral support in those early days when the classics were still the classics, and the proper place of the Priest of Nemi was in a footnote to Ovid, with a possible reference to Macaulay's 'Lays' thrown in.

Ten years passed, and in the meantime 'The Golden Bough' had once for all made good its footing within the spheres, or hemispheres, of letters and of science. A new edition appeared, which substituted three volumes for the original two. Though thus enlarged, the book retained its identity in all respects. The author retracted none of his theories; he merely sought to formulate them more exactly, to apply them more widely, and, in particular, to verify them and bring them home by means of fresh examples. The priest of Nemi still figured as the final cause of the argument. True, one lost sight of him ever and anon, while pursuing some devious twist of the maze. But that he stood for the central mystery, that the fifty thousand odd facts on which one had stumbled by the way would somehow be gathered up and expressed in this supreme fact, this epitome of human folly, this arch-superstition—to doubt this would have seemed rank heresy in the eyes of the now rapidly increasing party of the faithful.

Who, then, constituted this party of the faithful? In the first place, the public. 'The Golden Bough' is eminently readable. The lucidity of its style proves captivating even to those who profess to detect a certain obscurity in its logic. This is no philosopher's farrago of bloodless abstractions. The book is written in simple and sensuous language, as befits a circumstantial account of the simple life. We are children again as we study these childish doings of the peasant or the savage. No doubt, they behave as very naughty children sometimes. But who shall say that he was never a naughty child, or that it is not human to derive satisfaction from the story of one's infant peccadilloes? Not that the public cared a straw about the pros and cons relating to the problem concerning the priest of Nemi. That particular carrot might have to be dangled before the nose of the scholar, in order to carry him over the ground; but the public, being out for pleasure, contentedly browsed along the wayside, and found the rich mixed feeding all to its taste. If our imperial race is beginning to know something about those people of rudimentary culture whose fate is in its hands, it is in no small part due to the wide circulation achieved by 'The Golden Bough,' that golden treasury of stories for grown-up children.

Whether students of the classics in the course of a decade had become tolerant of a line of research which outraged their sense of self-sufficiency, is not so certain. The champions of sound scholarship in this country are, perhaps, more deeply versed and directly interested in teaching than in learning. The philologist and the ancient historian conspire to keep the archaeologist and the anthropologist out in the cold, not because they are at the bottom of their hearts obscurantists of the deepest dye, but simply because, as practical men, educators of youth, they do not see how such new-fangled stuff is profitably to be introduced into any existing curriculum. But even the highest educational authorities are but the servants of the public. If 'The Golden Bough' becomes a household word, it must e'en be admitted into general-knowledge papers; whereupon conscientious examiners must read the subject up. For the rest, the irrepressible Junior Fellow, sowing his intellectual wild oats, will insist on publishing an essay to the tune of the latest extravaganza. Thus by imperceptible degrees first the University and then the Public

School become resigned to the inevitable; and the paradox of yesterday, now advanced to the decent status of a commonplace, becomes part of what every schoolboy knows, and what every gentleman must at least have forgotten.

Further, whatever classical scholars might have come to think about 'The Golden Bough,' it was by this time acceptable in the eyes of the anthropologists, who had to confess that, despite its literary method, it had reached results that were in keeping with the strictest demands of Science. A year before the second edition appeared, Spencer and Gillen had published 'The Native Tribes of Central Australia,' a work which marks an epoch in the history of anthropological research. These first-hand observers had been for some time past in close touch with Dr. Frazer, who indeed had the privilege of access to early information in its most authentic form, seeing that he was charged by them with the final revision of their proofs. Now, the Arunta of the central deserts of Australia might have been expressly created in order to illustrate the principles of 'The 'Golden Bough.' They did not exhibit, perhaps, that particular complex of conditions which met in the priest of Nemi. But theirs was precisely that general attitude of mind which characterizes what Dr. Frazer terms the 'age of magic,' when man's one idea of getting anything done is to pull at invisible strings by which miraculous agencies are supposed to be set in motion. Thanks to the unexampled thoroughness of the scrutiny to which these customs and beliefs had been submitted by the explorers, it was borne in upon all how these savages of the Antipodes, the most backward of mankind, stood upside down in relation to ourselves not only geographically but, as it were, mentally as well. Our sense was as their nonsense, and our nonsense as their sense. None the less, they managed to rub along after a fashion in this topsy-turvy world of theirs. Though they were sheer irrationalists, should one judge them by logic, they were rational enough, should one judge them by life. Hence the anthropological world, hailing as it did the work of Spencer and Gillen with instant acclamation as the key to a new psychology of the savage, found itself almost unconsciously committed to the contention of 'The Golden Bough' that superstition was as the very soul of primitive culture. The book had got the values right after all. Mannhardt's peasants must mean business, or must have only just left off meaning

business, seeing that in the heart of Australia things every whit as fantastic and absurd are being done day by day in the soberest earnest, and, in fact, constitute for the doers well-nigh the whole meaning of their life. Thus the second edition of 'The Golden Bough,' backed by the anthropologists almost to a man, had no longer anything to fear from the assaults of the captious amateur. It might have been a fairy-tale once; but now it was science.

One group of thinkers, however, might be inclined to hold that, whether the first edition was edifying or not, the second was unprofitable and even positively baneful. The theologians were startled to find that, by some trick of analogous reasoning, the priest of Nemi was now brought into relation with the Founder of Christianity. Of course it might be said that considerations of a purely anthropological nature could bear at most only on the historical setting of the sacred story; that, so far as the divinity of Christ was affected, the possible resemblance to a mock-king of the Saccæa thrust upon him by the circumstances of the time was neither here nor there. But Christianity, after all, is, in one aspect, a manifestation conditioned by time and circumstance. Even if the Church was divinely instituted, its history cannot be entirely dissevered from the general history of religious belief. It was, to say the least, ominous, therefore, that, in a treatise dedicated to primitive superstition, there should be introduced a discussion of Christian origins. Moreover, the author's personal convictions, as might be gathered from his general tone, and, more particularly, from his references to other reputed Saviours of humanity, were clearly unfavourable to the exemption of any form of religious faith from the law of historic continuity. Indeed, if open scandal was averted, if the passages that gave offence to the orthodox were, if in no wise condoned, at least received in comparative silence, it was largely because, on closer investigation, the case against them appeared so thin, the analogies on which it rested so far-fetched, that Christian apologists might safely decide to leave such a theory to explode itself.

The second decade having passed, a third edition was projected, and within the space of three years has been triumphantly brought to completion. The two volumes of the first edition have now expanded into ten. In what sense

is it 'The Golden Bough' any longer? Appalled by the luxuriance of the encompassing growths we may well echo the prayer of Aeneas:

> 'Si nunc se nobis ille aureus arbore ramus
> Ostendat nemore in tanto!'

Indeed, it might seem that the disciple of Robertson Smith sought, after the manner of disciples, to go one step better than his master; inasmuch as, instead of editing, he had now actually composed an encyclopædia. The whole circuit of the superstitious beliefs of savages being comprised in its survey, 'The Golden Bough,' never remarkable for uniformity of plot, must henceforth throw aside the last pretence of dramatic unity, and resolve itself into a series of dissolving views, a panorama of the primitive life and mind.

Nay, this change of design is openly acknowledged. In the preface to the seventh and concluding part, entitled 'Balder the Beautiful,' the long-suspected cat is at last let out of the bag.

> 'Balder the Beautiful,' writes Dr. Frazer, 'in my hands is little more than a stalking horse to carry two heavy pack-loads of facts. And what is true of Balder applies equally to the priest of Nemi himself, the nominal hero of the long tragedy of human folly and suffering which has unrolled itself before the readers of these volumes, and on which the curtain is about to fall. He, too, for all the quaint garb he wears and the gravity with which he stalks across the stage, is merely a puppet, and it is time to unmask him before laying him in the box.'

It is no longer the function of the facts to support the theories, but rather that of the theories to support the facts. Dr. Frazer declares a little later on:

> 'In this as in other branches of study it is the fate of theories to be washed away like the children's castles of sand by the rising tide of knowledge, and I am not so presumptuous as to expect or desire for mine an exemption from the common lot. I hold them all very lightly, and have used them chiefly as convenient pegs on which to hang my collections of facts. For I believe that, while theories are transitory, a record of facts has a permanent value, and that as a chronicle of ancient customs and beliefs my book may retain its utility when my theories are as obsolete as the customs and beliefs themselves deserve to be.'

Now, without prejudice to the question of the value of Dr. Frazer's theories, it may be admitted at once that, con-

sidered merely as a corpus of assorted evidence, his book amounts to a liberal education in social anthropology. Indeed, it will usually be found that those who seek to refute his doctrines have to rely on data of his providing; that, in fact, if he cannot be convicted out of his own mouth, the thing is not to be managed at all. The literature from which anthropology is obliged to gather its facts is highly miscellaneous in type, and in quality too often leaves much to be desired, yielding gold by the grain and rubbish by the ton. Hence to have more or less exhaustively searched through the entire mass of material, as Dr. Frazer has done, and to have framed an apparatus of *Schriftquellen* containing everything that his critical sense approves as most authentic, is an heroic achievement in itself, and one that earns him the gratitude of all his co-workers. It only remains to point out in this context that, in order to render the present edition thoroughly serviceable as a book of reference, a supplementary volume is needed in which its seven indexes are reduced to one, and a full bibliography appended; and it is understood that such a tourist's guide will shortly appear.

So much for Dr. Frazer's collection of facts. It epitomises all the available information. Let us remember, too, that the sources of such information are daily and hourly drying up. Hence Dr. Frazer's hope that the book will long retain its usefulness as a conspectus of evidence would seem certain of fulfilment; even if in the future that fuller endowment and organisation of anthropological research, of which there are signs in the sky, should bring about a far more intensive study of such traces of primitive culture as anywhere remain, causing the older data to appear somewhat thin and superficial by comparison.

But is not Dr. Frazer unduly half-hearted about his theories? Will he not, on second thoughts, wish his book long life as much because of its theories as because of its facts, impressive as the latter are? For surely it is incorrect to say, as he does, that theories as such are transitory, while facts endure. Not to go too deeply into the logic of the matter, may not the prevailing law be expressed thus? Good theories and the facts that bear witness to them tend to be preserved together, and together go to form established truth; whereas bad theories are gradually weeded out, and usually carry with

them to perdition most of the so-called facts—facts imperfectly described and hence as they stand useless—to which they were originally wedded. Perhaps Dr. Frazer's theories have become for himself a little staled by dint of repetition; seeing that now for the third time he states them in what are essentially the same terms. But for the rest of us they do not cease on that account to form the living soul of his book; and by its soul must a book be judged. To a consideration of these theories in their broader aspects let us therefore now proceed.

Of questions of theory, the most far-reaching of all is suggested by the very sub-title of 'The Golden Bough,' which describes it as 'a Study in Magic and Religion.' What, then, is meant by 'Magic and Religion'? Now, so long as the words are taken together as if they formed one composite idea—just as, to take a homely instance, 'bread and butter' may stand for a single notion—the problem of providing a working definition of each of the terms used hardly arises. On that view of his meaning, Dr. Frazer would merely be saying in plain English that his subject was what anthropologists are pleased to call 'the magico-religious.' As a catalogue-maker's label for hitting off comprehensively the contents of 'The Golden Bough,' this could hardly be bettered. Whatever magic and religion may severally in essence be—a matter in considerable dispute—there is no doubt that all would agree to recognise this particular collection of material as thoroughly representative of the magico-religious. It is as if one visited an Anglo-German Exhibition, not knowing how to tell purely English work from purely German work, and either of these from work that might be of mixed origin, but satisfied that this was the right place in which to learn to discriminate all these possible varieties. One would feel grateful to the organiser of such a show, even if left by him to do the sorting for ourselves.

Dr. Frazer, however, has not only organised for our benefit a Magico-Religious Exhibition on the vastest scale; he has likewise tried to show us how to sort the goods by reference to their origin, if only we choose to accept a simple and straightforward principle of division. It is as if the director of the Anglo-German combination laid it down that work made in England or in Germany counted respectively as English or

German, while work made partly in one and partly in the other country must count as mixed. Here would be a plain-sailing rule, and one sufficient for most purposes, even if it failed to cope with possible objections—as, for example, that work made in England by Germans might be thoroughly German in spirit. Such difficulties, indeed, might even seem rather far-fetched to a business man intent on handling goods in gross.

Dr. Frazer, then, who also must handle his goods in gross, seeing that, while his *cadres* are few, his *collectanea* are beyond all counting, resorts to a rough-and-ready plan of classifying the magical, the religious, and the mixed, among his magico-religious exhibits. The religious, according to him, always involves some sort of appeal to a god. The magical, on the other hand, has nothing to do with a god, but implies some form of would-be scientific attempt to control nature, based on the fallacious belief that subjective associations may be taken at their face value for objective connexions. Finally, the mixed type of fact results wherever magic, the pseudo-science, having done its best or worst, makes common cause with religion in order that the latter may call in a god to put the matter through. Such are the proposed criteria, which have this merit at least, that they lend themselves readily to practical employment. An appeal to a god, and an experiment in misapplied association of ideas, ought to be easy enough to detect and to distinguish: it remains to show that this somewhat summary version of Dr. Frazer's definitions of magic and religion does justice to his meaning.

'By religion,' says Dr. Frazer, 'I understand a propitiation or conciliation of powers superior to man which are believed to direct and control the course of nature and of human life. Thus defined, religion consists of two elements, a theoretical and a practical, namely, a belief in powers higher than man and an attempt to propitiate or please them. Of the two, belief clearly comes first, since we must believe in the existence of a divine being before we can attempt to please him. But unless the belief leads to a corresponding practice, it is not a religion but merely a theology; in the language of St. James, "faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone." In other words, "no man is religious who does not govern his conduct in some measure by the fear or love of God."' ('The Magic Art,' i. 222–3.)

What exactly Dr. Frazer means by a God is brought out in the following quotation from a work of even more recent date:

'By a God I understand a superhuman and supernatural being, of a spiritual and personal nature, who controls the world or some part of it on the whole for good, and who is endowed with intellectual faculties, moral feelings, and active powers which we can only conceive on the analogy of human faculties, feelings, and activities, though we are bound to suppose that in the divine nature they exist in higher degrees, perhaps in infinitely higher degrees, than the corresponding faculties, feelings, and activities of man. In short, by a God I mean a beneficent supernatural spirit, the ruler of the world or of some part of it, who resembles man in nature though he excels him in knowledge, goodness, and power. This is, I think, the sense in which the ordinary man speaks of a God, and I believe that he is right in so doing.' ('The Belief in Immortality,' i. 9–10.)

Here, then, is our anthropological criterion: a savage is to be accounted religious when he recognises and tries to please a being corresponding to what the plain man—the plain Englishman, in other words—understands by a God. Dr. Frazer adds that religion as thus defined is opposed in principle to science; since 'it clearly assumes that the course of nature 'is to some extent elastic or variable, and that we can persuade 'or induce the mighty beings who control it to deflect, for our 'benefit, the current of events from the channel in which they 'would otherwise flow.'

Magic is identified by Dr. Frazer with 'that sympathetic 'magic, as it may be called, which plays a large part in most 'systems of superstition.' This has two branches, homœopathic magic and contagious magic; and whether the savage mind is aware of any unity between the two Dr. Frazer regards as doubtful. On psychological analysis, however, they turn out, in our author's view, to be 'merely two different mis-'applications of the associations of ideas.'

'Homœopathic magic is founded on the association of ideas by similarity: contagious magic is founded on the association of ideas by contiguity. Homœopathic magic commits the mistake of assuming that things which resemble each other are the same: contagious magic commits the mistake of assuming that things which have once been in contact with each other are always in contact.' ('The Magic Art,' i. 53–54.)

Now, 'the principles of association are excellent in themselves, 'and indeed absolutely essential to the working of the human 'mind. Legitimately applied they yield science; illegitimately 'applied they yield magic, the bastard sister of science.' Magic is therefore, like science, opposed in principle to religion, since it assumes 'that the processes of nature are rigid and 'invariable in their operation.' It deals with 'impersonal 'forces,' and hence aims at control, not conciliation. In so far as it seeks to affect the conduct of personal beings, whether men or gods, it presupposes them to be *pro tanto* subject to such impersonal forces, namely, to 'the operation of immutable 'laws acting mechanically.' It remains to note that not only manipulations but abstentions are governed by magical considerations.

'The system of sympathetic magic is not merely composed of positive precepts; it comprises a very large number of negative precepts, that is, prohibitions. It tells you not merely what to do, but also what to leave undone. The positive precepts are charms: the negative precepts are taboos. In fact, the whole doctrine of taboo, or at all events a large part of it, would seem to be only a special application of sympathetic magic, with its two great laws of similarity and contact.'

The qualification 'or at all events a large part of it' was added in the third edition in deference to criticism; but Dr. Frazer nowhere explains what other source of taboos is, on his principles, possible.

The mixture of magic and religion is, according to Dr. Frazer, not primitive. Magic, being deduced immediately from elementary processes of reasoning, is an error into which the mind falls almost spontaneously. 'The very beasts 'associate the ideas of things that are like each other or that 'have been found together in their experience.' Whence, by the way, it would seem to follow that the beasts, in so far as they fall short of science (they have their vivisectionists, of course), are constitutionally addicted to the practice of magic. It was, in fact, a rival magician who killed Cock Robin. On the other hand:

'Who attributes to the animals a belief that the phenomena of nature are worked by a multitude of invisible animals, or by one enormous and prodigiously strong animal behind the scenes? It is probably no injustice to the brutes to assume that the honour of

devising a theory of this latter sort must be reserved for human reason.'

Passing on from these somewhat speculative analogies, Dr. Frazer calls attention to the ways of the aborigines of Australia as representing 'the most backward state of human society 'now known to us.' 'The men in Australia are magicians, 'but not one is a priest; everybody fancies he can influence 'his fellows or the course of nature by sympathetic magic, 'but nobody dreams of propitiating gods by prayers or sacri-'fice.' Hence:

'May we not reasonably conjecture that the civilised races of the world have also at some period of their history passed through a similar intellectual phase, that they attempted to force the great powers of nature to do their pleasure before they thought of courting their favour by offerings and prayer—in short, that, just as on the material side of human culture there has everywhere been an Age of Stone, so on the intellectual side there has everywhere been an Age of Magic?'

Dr. Frazer, further, makes it clear that he considers such a faith in magic to have been prior in time not merely to the belief in spiritual beings worthy to rank as gods, but to any belief in spirits at all. He then goes on to 'venture to surmise' that the change from magic to religion may have been brought about by the 'great discovery of the inefficacy of magic.' Recognising their own inability to control nature, he thinks, men would naturally come to imagine that it was controlled by supernatural beings. When Dr. Frazer speaks of 'the 'inefficacy of magic,' he clearly means the inefficacy of actual as opposed to ideal magic; since he proceeds to suggest that the mark of the transition from magic to religion may be the belief that gods are magicians. Thus the supposed argument of 'our primitive philosopher' would run thus: Magic as such must work; man's magic does not work; therefore the magic that does work must be in the hands of a superman, and I must ask him to work it in my interest. Meanwhile, the transition must be held to have been gradual, man being slow to admit his absolute failure, and hence calling in the aid of spirits and gods just in so far as he could not manage by himself. Hence phenomena of the mixed type, in which the masterful and the prayerful attitudes are found together, just as in the aeneolithic period stone lingered on by the side of metal.

It has been necessary to examine at some length Dr. Frazer's definitions of magic and religion, partly because his treatment of this fundamental problem determines the whole orientation of his book, and partly because no more telling illustration is to be found of his favourite method of referring the origins of institutions to purely intellectual processes. Let it be said at once that, for the purposes of a rough-and-ready classification such as will best suit the plain man, his distinction between religion as what amounts to worship and magic as something which, while it occupies much the same place in the lives of respectable Australians as religion does in the lives of respectable Britons, does not amount to worship, is tolerably adequate. If priests, temples, prayers, sacrifices, gods are there, everyone will admit that it is religion. If none of them are there, most people will think that it is something else, and will be as ready to dub it magic as not; more especially since the plain man has been apt at every stage of culture to set down any kind of religion that he does not understand as magical, even though it was once the religion of his own ancestors. Dr. Frazer, by the way, has told us how religion, owing to a change in the intellectual outlook of those concerned, may come to replace magic; but he quite omits to explain how it is that when religion goes downhill and drops its temples, priests, and so on, it has a way of turning again into magic, as has happened conspicuously in the case of those agricultural rites of the European peasant in which Dr. Frazer's analysis discovers magical elements and little else besides. Has the European peasant thought the matter over afresh, accepted as his working hypothesis the inefficacy of religion, and deliberately gone back to the pseudo-scientific experimentation of his remote forefathers? Perhaps it is better not to press this point, in the interest of what is otherwise so neat a distinction. Religion is what the plain man knows as religion, and magic is—well, the rest.

This is, perhaps, hardly the place in which to elaborate a counter-theory. Suffice it to say that a less intellectualistic method of explaining the genesis of magic and religion regarded as social institutions is bound to lead to somewhat different results. A simple way of bringing the matter to a head would be to ask the question, Can there be a non-theistic type of religion? Dr. Frazer is bound to answer 'No'; and conse-

quently, with perfect consistency, he would convict the Australians of Spencer and Gillen of living in a state of almost unadulterated magic. M. Durkheim, on the other hand, setting out to write a work on the elementary forms of the religious life, chooses the totemic system of these very Australians as his crucial instance of what religion essentially is for a tribe of pure hunters and gatherers. Dr. Frazer may be inclined to object that the difference is one of words—that he means by the term 'religion' one thing and M. Durkheim another thing. But how could the two definitions fail to disagree, when the methods to which they are relative stand utterly opposed to one another? Dr. Frazer's method is simply to ask whether a given body of associated beliefs and practices is signalised by the presence of a certain concept. But M. Durkheim's method, going deeper, considers whether it fulfils a certain social and moral function.

Thus, as regards these tribes of Central Australia, Dr. Frazer finds that their totems, reincarnating ancestors, nature-spirits and so forth, hardly amount, all told, to a theistic system. On the other hand, a goodly number of their ritual performances appear to turn on the sympathetic principle, as when the witchetty-grub people tap on a big stone with little stones round it, because it is like a witchetty-grub surrounded by its eggs. All this complex of thoughts and acts, therefore, Dr. Frazer would assign to the domain and age of magic; regardless of the fact that the people themselves say that the totemic ceremonies make them 'strong' and 'glad' and 'good,' and, in short, hold them to embody and express the highest values that life has to offer them, whereas in sharp contradistinction they treat certain mystic practices, such as the use of the pointing-stick, as belonging to a black art punishable by death. Now, M. Durkheim takes his stand on this very difference, so fundamental in the view of those immediately concerned, between things that are sacred and things that are accursed, and discovers herein the true counterpart to our own distinction between religion and magic. By this means he is able to explain something that Dr. Frazer, had he noticed it, would have been at sore pains to explain away, namely, the fact that religion and magic are not strangers, but competitors and rivals—that their spheres do not lie utterly apart, but represent incompatible claims to rule one and the same

world on the part, as we may say, of God and the devil, respectively. Rejecting, then, the specious but superficial analogy with natural science, M. Durkheim makes magic stand for all maleficent and anti-social ways of exploiting the unseen and occult, and religion for all such ways of dealing therewith as are supposed to further the common welfare. That such a view rests on a more penetrating analysis of the moral forces that constitute society goes almost without saying. It is possible, however, that the plain man will find such considerations somewhat fine-spun and hard to follow, and will prefer to declare that he knows of no obvious mark whereby the sacred can be distinguished, if it fall short of the divine. Meanwhile, Dr. Frazer's principle of classification has at least this virtue—that it is not over-subtle.

It is high time to pass onwards to the examination of other doctrines composing the theoretical backbone of 'The Golden 'Bough.' A striking feature of the first edition was a discussion of the origin and meaning of sacrifice. Robertson Smith's views on this question, as set forth in his article 'Sacri-'fice' in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' seemed then to Dr. Frazer to 'mark a new departure in the historical study of 'religion.' Nay, more, he writes in the preface, 'The central 'idea of my essay—the conception of the slain god—is derived 'directly, I believe, from my friend.' Ten years later in the preface to the second edition there is an amazing change of tone.

'Messrs. H. Hubert and M. Mauss have represented my theory of the slain god as intended to supplement and complete Robertson Smith's theory of the derivation of animal sacrifice in general from a totem sacrament. On this I have to say that the two theories are quite independent of each other. I never assented to my friend's theory, and, so far as I can remember, he never gave me a hint that he assented to mine.'

What has happened in the meantime to discredit Robertson Smith's theory of sacrifice in Dr. Frazer's eyes? Apparently nothing. On the contrary, this hypothesis, which assumed that animal sacrifice in general had developed out of a totemic sacrament, whereby the totemites were mystically united in, by, and with the 'theanthropic' animal that bestowed on them their corporate identity, had been confirmed—one might almost say crucially verified—by the discovery of Spencer

and Gillen that in Central Australia the very rite required was to-day in full force. Why, then, has the slain god broken completely with the totemic victim? Partly, no doubt, because Dr. Frazer's further researches into totemism, which were destined ultimately to fill the massive volumes of his 'Totemism and Exogamy,' were leading him to lay more stress on the social side of the institution, and less on what he had at first termed its 'religious' side; partly, too, because his slain god had vegetable affinities which he found hard to relate to any form of the blood-sacrifice. Surely, however, the most cogent reason of all was that it was impossible, if he wished to maintain his hard-and-fast distinction between magic and religion, to allow the totemism or the sacramentalism of his typical representatives of the 'age of magic' to be religious in any way whatsoever. At the time when the first edition saw the light, Dr. Frazer, as he tells us in so many words, was disposed to class magic loosely under religion as one of its lower forms. Hence to derive a god from a totem, and worship from a sacramental meal, was at this stage of his thought the most natural thing in the world. Afterwards, he cuts off magic from religion 'as if with a hatchet.' The inevitable result is that totems and gods find themselves ranged on opposite sides of a conceptual hiatus. As for the sacrament of communion, it must be rated a form of magic, the survival of which as the central mystery of the religion of the civilised world is, to say the least, an odd coincidence.

But if the slain god, being an affair of religion, cannot be derived any longer from the sacrifice of a totemic animal, nor, presumably, from any operation of vegetation-magic, is his origin to be sought in that slaying of the king, about which Dr. Frazer has amassed so many interesting and novel particulars? Let us note in passing how a sagacious use of the comparative method is apt to be crowned with what amounts to a gift of divination, so accurately is the course of future discovery foretold. Just as Robertson Smith anticipated the totemic sacrament of the Australians, so no less brilliantly Dr. Frazer described years ago a regicidal philosophy of which the perfect exponents were but the other day discovered by Dr. Seligmann in the Shilluk of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. Facts of this kind as facts were very hard to believe at first; and the world has every reason to be grateful to Dr. Frazer

for piling up paradoxical instance upon instance, until the British middle-class, with what Matthew Arnold calls its 'blood-'thirsty love of life,' had to own that there existed other people who regarded the happy despatch as a natural tribute to royalty, and were all agog to take office with the certain prospect of martyrdom at the next election. But does the theory therewith supplied fit the important facts in question? If the slain god is to be correlated with the slain king, the king must first be proved divine. This can be done of course, after a somewhat unconvincing fashion, by making out the king to be possessed by a god or spirit that, being independent of him, enters and confers a purely extrinsic divinity. Now no one would deny that such a theory of possession is perfectly compatible with savage notions. But is it the sole theory applicable to this group of facts, and will it cover all of them? It is, to say the least, suspicious that chiefs and kings should be intrinsically *tabu*. Surely this almost universal sacredness of theirs, which moreover is often a quality held to be transmissible to their descendants and successors, is not wholly distinct in nature from the divinity attributed to certain chiefs and kings in particular. But Dr. Frazer, having defined *tabu* as a negative magic, becomes once more the victim of his own logical hatchet. The sacred which is not divine and the sacred which is divine are by definition cut off from each other, and that one should pass into the other is therefore inconceivable; even if this process should appear to occur, as, awkwardly enough, it does.

It would be possible to illustrate in many another way the disastrous consequences of this root-fallacy consisting in the refusal to recognise a non-theistic type of religion; but criticism has been carried far enough, and it is only fair, in conclusion, to express, however inadequately, a grateful sense of all that Dr. Frazer's great work has done to consolidate and advance anthropological science. Even if Dr. Frazer has on theoretical grounds predicated discontinuity, where the facts proclaim continuity, in regard to the religious history of man, he has at any rate by the comprehensiveness of his survey set those facts together in visible juxtaposition, if not always in intelligible interconnexion. We work backwards and forwards between the rites of the peasant farmers of Europe, modern or classical, and those of the savage hunters

of the darker continents, and it matters little whether we are bidden to class some as invocations and others as incantations so long as we are made to realise that the same childlike cry of the human soul, 'May we have day by day our daily bread,' is expressed throughout, whether manually or orally, whether through this set of symbols or through that. Moreover, we are shown that the hope of man rests chiefly on the experience of the ever-present mystery of renewal. In his own life, and in the life of nature, death is balanced and even outbalanced by birth, vital loss by vital increase. Now the key to the mystery of renewal lies partly without in the discovery of scientific appliances, but mainly within in the discovery how to maintain a strong heart. That practical philosophy of life which is human religion could never afford to make the mistake of putting the machines before the strong heart, for the simple reason that societies that trusted to the machines rather than to the men behind the machines have abandoned their chance of renewal and gone down in death. Savages and simple folk of all sorts can teach our so-called civilisation an important lesson, inasmuch as their view of the universe regularly puts the moral aspect above the mechanical. It is shallow to regard the totemic ritual of Australia as a sort of science of stock-raising gone wrong. What you have first to learn in the deserts of Australia is how to go without your dinner on occasions, and nevertheless to fare on bravely until you find one. Having by the aid of your rites made yourself 'strong' and 'glad' and 'good,' then you get good hunting as a matter of course; and even then you have the decency and the sound sense to ascribe your good fortune, not to yourself, but to the higher powers that are with and in you, yet are never merely you. Religion has been intellectualised as civilisation has advanced; but whether the human heart has been moralised in like proportion is not so certain. At any rate the savage, or the little child, may have something to teach the doctors, if the latter incline to suppose that theology is equivalent to religion, or are tempted to forget that knowledge is but the servant of desire and hope and faith.

'The Golden Bough,' more than any other book, has taught our generation to view the religious world as a whole—a world full of sad confusion, it may be, yet none the less charac-

teristically our own. To Dr. Frazer, who has laboured to such splendid purpose, our deepest gratitude is due; for by the magic of his pen he has made the myriad facts live, so that they tell their own tale, and we are left free to read their meaning as our several tastes and temperaments dictate. Straining hard at the desk he has perhaps at times felt in his own person the burden of existence, and has to that extent become sympathetically conscious of the dead weight of folly and ignorance that has ever lain on the shoulders of the human pilgrim and helped to keep his eyes towards the ground. Yet Dr. Frazer has endured and won his way through to our lasting benefit. So too then man has endured and won on; and that fact, after all, shows something better than folly and ignorance to have been there all along to help him on his way.

R. R. Marett.

CURRENT LITERATURE

1. **Men and Matters.** By WILFRID WARD. Longmans, Green. 1914.
2. **Lectures on Dryden.** Delivered by A. W. VERRALL, Litt.D. Edited by Margaret de G. Verrall. Cambridge University Press. 1914.
3. **Notes of a Son and Brother.** By HENRY JAMES. Macmillan. 1914.
4. **Walt Whitman: a Critical Study.** By BASIL DE SÉLINCOURT Secker. 1914.
5. **A Song of Honour.** By RALPH HODGSON. 'Flying Fame.' 1914.
6. **New Numbers.** By WILFRID WILSON GIBSON, RUPERT BROOKE, LASCELLES ABERCROMBIE, and JOHN DRINKWATER. (Published at Ryton, Dymock, Gloucester.) 1914.
7. **The Collected Poems of Margaret L. Woods.** John Lane. 1914.
8. **Cathay and the Way Thither.** Translated by Sir HENRY YULE. New Edition by HENRI CORDIER. Vol. II. Odoric of Pordenone. The Hakluyt Society. 1913.

MR. WILFRID WARD in 'Men and Matters' confronts his readers, bearing a standard in one hand and a branch of olive in the other. His attitude is conciliatory, his text moderation. There is none the less a definite point, alike in religious and political controversy, when, in his judgment, conciliation must be surrendered for a steadfast insistence upon conviction, when moderation tends only to weakness.

The most important of the fourteen papers contained in this volume are concerned with the polity of the Roman and Catholic Church. They deal with questions comprehensively discussed in Mr. Fawkes's 'Essays in Modernism.' But while Mr. Fawkes dealt with these questions from the standpoint of the Modernist, independent of, if not in direct conflict with, ecclesiastical authority, Mr. Ward denies the validity of private judgment, and pleads, if not for servile submission to authority, at least for the full recognition and appreciation of the absolute necessity for authority, in matters of faith.

The views of these two writers then are fundamentally opposed. It is all the more significant that their arguments—so far as a mere student of their work can venture to judge—tend to much the same conclusions. On the one hand, Mr. Ward urges the claims of a grave and deliberate conservatism. On the other, he insists no less strongly on the vital need of reconstruction. Two enemies incessantly threaten every ancient institution—those who would altogether destroy it, and those who refuse to preserve its integrity by judicious repair. Eventual and complete decay is certain, if authority is only another term for reaction, conservatism for fossilism. Destruction is no less certain if innovation is given its utmost license.

Modernism, according to Mr. Ward, is only the last of numerous drastic attempts to express Christianity in terms of the thought of the day. Such attempts have always led to heresy. But since it has ever been the wise, however reluctant, practice of the Church to make of the *débris* of error the materials for her own renewal, since heresies (and Mr. Ward is rich in instances) have always been but stepping stones towards the farther shore, so too, now, he pleads, let history repeat itself. Let the innovator restrain what may amount to an anarchical passion for reorganisation; let conservatism bestir itself out of a too rigid devotion to tradition, out of stagnation. Excess, either active or passive, is only a menace of ruin.

A like argument recurs in a paper inspired by the prospectus of the 'Constructive Quarterly Review' on 'Union among 'Christians.' Mr. Ward's views are at the same time generous and cautious. The Church is a living organism. All its parts are therefore essential to its well-being, its very life; though not all its parts are equal in dignity. This should be true also of every religious denomination. Even then, though agreement were universal regarding capital doctrines, so long as agreement were not complete in all particulars, no corporate Church could survive the lesser sacrifice. The ideal aim is that every group of Christians should preserve its *esprit de corps*, but should at the same time refrain from mutual hostility. Mr. Ward gazes ardently and amicably out of the citadel, but at last withdraws his head. He desires peace earnestly—with sword in hand.

In politics he ventures into the open. Here compromise is no less desirable but far less dangerous. 'Those who would 'simply resist the democracy are not real Conservatives. 'For simply to resist it is to fail to preserve the influence of 'Catholicism on the people.' Substitute 'Toryism' for the 'Catholicism' of this passage, and the argument is no less cogent. Union among politicians is almost as transcendental an aspiration as union among Churchmen. But while in religion Mr. Ward would not tolerate the view that humanity, not any particular Church, is the corporate organism, in politics, in social questions, it is the State, the nation that is such an organism, and too complete a severance between parties is the real danger of modern times. It tends to waste, to ineptitude, to nothing but continual strife. Government becomes a mere game of skill, a play of opportunism. Party allegiance is carried to a paralysing excess. The demagogue becomes indispensable to either side. Even Democracy is swayed by its least common multiple of intelligence. A plague on all your parties, then. Let the truly enlightened, let the chivalry of the golden mean come out from the camp of the extremists. Let them combine into one more party yet, a National party. Granted that their numbers and their zeal suffice, theirs will be the balance of power.

The formation of such a party was one of Disraeli's early dreams—one from which he awakened. Two extremely entertaining essays in this volume are given over to the scrutiny and analysis of his baffling and enticing personality. Disraeli, though the characters and achievements of his great contemporaries are an old tale thoroughly told, remains an enigma. Sincerity and cynicism, genius and meretriciousness, Oriental sinuosity and Western grit, all these qualities Mr. Ward discovers in one whom we may (with a good deal of latitude) call his hero. Disraeli's 'brilliance' (blinding quality!), the dazzlement of his career, are alone beyond dispute. He was the very prince of fairy tale princes—in a realistic story aimed solely at adults. Little Claus, by comparison, was but an amateur in judicious duplicity. He 'basked in lime-'light'; craved a fame 'now and hot, with plenty of sweets.' At the bidding of his public he hurled his epic lyre 'to 'limbo.' 'He is to be depended on to a certain degree,' wrote his adoring wife after some years' experience. Mr. Ward

acknowledges that his skin was of the toughest, that his conscience (in Carlyle's term) was inclined to be rotatory, that his adaptations to circumstance were little short of chameleonic. But he is apologetic on the side of appreciation, and cordially dissents from Lord Cromer's conviction that Disraeli was nothing but a political adventurer. So eager is his defence that in the course of it Mr. Gladstone is offered up as a victim, and even Cardinal Newman is cited to prove that Disraeli's most crucial aberration from the truth may have in part been due to a pathetic lapse of memory. Extremists, again, on either side will dissent from Mr. Ward's conclusions, but none will deny that he owes to Disraeli two extremely engaging essays.

Mr. Chesterton's 'Orthodoxy' is the inspiration of yet another paper. But here, as in his graceful eulogy of George Wyndham, Mr. Ward allows moderation to bloom into rapture. Burke, Butler, Coleridge, Tertullian, Dr. McCosh, Mr. Balfour, Archbishop Temple, St. Justin—Mr. Chesterton is fellow to them all. Mr. Ward is not to be dazed by paradox or epigram. Beneath their crackling effulgence he admires the distended view. Such fireworks are merely 'a concession to the taste 'of an age that hates being bored.' It is Mr. Chesterton's common sense that really matters. '"Orthodoxy" gives us 'as a permanent legacy more of original and practically helpful 'suggestions than perhaps anything which has appeared in 'our own day, on Chateaubriand's theme, "the Genius of '"Christianity."'

One last quotation we must indulge in—from an essay that simmers with humorous anecdote, 'Tennyson at 'Freshwater.' Mr. Ward once shared with Locker Lampson the inestimable privilege of hearing Tennyson read. The poem was 'Vastness.' All went well until, at one stanza of this solemn chant, youth actually had the courage to be visibly amused:—

> 'Love for the maiden, crowned with marriage,
> No regrets for aught that has been;
> Debtless competence, comely children,
> Happy household, sober and clean. . . .'

On that day the poet read no more. But the very salt of the story is the fact that Tennyson's revision (recited after breakfast next morning), though it had polished 'sober

'and clean' into 'golden mean,' had left that seraphically Victorian second line in all its maidenly charm.

Modern poetry owes very little to the influence of Dryden. He wrote straight from the shoulder. His prose fits his ideas as a glove fits the hand. It is of a clarity as smooth and almost as hard as that of glass—the easy, trenchant, vigorous talk of a man of affairs, of substance, of presence, of the great and busy world. The example of these invaluable qualities came at a time when most it was needed. Dryden's verse is in essence that same prose exalted, adorned, set to music, the finest possible vehicle for wit and invective, sonorous and defiant as a flourish of trumpets. It consists of statements, never of hints. It comes as near to the nakedly substantial as words can contrive. The hare and hound, the falcon in his 'Annus Mirabilis,' are as sharp and clear in detail as a Dürer engraving. One can almost feel the cold silver of his angels. As for his 'astral or aerial spirits,' they were introduced into his poetry merely to please. 'Whether 'there are such beings or not, it concerns not me.' This substantial good sense (an excellent quality too easily corrupted by the temptations of metre), this eloquence, delighted an age of reason of which Dryden was the bluff and genial precursor. Johnson considered his 'Ode to the Pious 'Memory of Mrs. Anne Killigrew' the noblest that our language ever produced. A 'rich complex of sounds' it unquestionably is. But no man was ever won by it to desire the Paradise to which Dryden's pompous rhetoric consigned 'the youngest virgin daughter of the skies.' Stars, palms, seraphim, they are only intellectual (and even somewhat theatrical) abstractions. Could indeed any conceivable Anne Killigrew be for one moment happy in realms of such 'superior 'bliss'? The shorter poems are more human, though rarely without a hardening touch of the facetious. The Odes too often stir a recollection of the lion as described in the old Elizabethan Bestiary—a beast which the author stated was gifted by Providence with a sharp hook in the tuft of its tail wherewith to lash itself into a 'noble rage.' Leonine Dryden was, none the less. His arrogant assurance (that enabled him to address the City of London as if it were a good little boy), his masterly range as playwright, satirist,

critic, his very defects as a poet, secured for him an eminence among his contemporaries that no Englishman of letters has excelled. He remains a massive, isolated, and inspiring figure.

Inspired by a profound admiration of these great qualities, Dr. Verrall chose Dryden for the subject of twelve Lectures, which he delivered at Cambridge in 1911. These lectures, as Mrs. Verrall explains in her preface, were addressed to students, in the hope of rescuing Dryden's work from the comparative neglect into which it had fallen, and, possibly, of reanimating his metrical principles. The present volume consists solely of Notes—full and coherent enough to make excellent reading. Their occasional digressions, their 'uncon-'ventionalities' and easiness, give them a happy touch of personality for which a careful elaboration could have been at most only an equivalent. Dr. Verrall's estimate evades neither the obligations of justice, nor the privilege of mercy. While quietly agreeing that Dryden could on occasion sacrifice judgment to convenience, he no less quietly rejects Macaulay's summary indictment of 'a life of mendicancy and adulation'; while on a less vital question his decision is—'no one is 'bound to be a Milton.' He is conscious of a certain coldness of emotion in the poet, but admires his ceremoniousness, and affirms that at his most serious moments he is at his best.

Among Dr. Verrall's digressions must be included his pages on the 'poetic unities,' at the same time the most learned and dogmatic and the most interesting in his book. But it is his insistence on Dryden's 'technical excellence,' on the 'supreme skill' for instance, of the violin stanza in the 'Ode 'on St. Cecilia's Day,' and his own views of metrical craft, that are the most provocative features of his book. He may make few converts just now, but his lucid and vigorous opinions should be exceedingly valuable as an antidote against the extravagances of an opposite school.

'I like ambiguities, and detest great glares,' says Mr. Henry James in his 'Notes of a Son and Brother.' In the 'cool 'and the shade,' indeed, Mr. James's reader journeys, never in danger of being dazzled, though here and there he may find himself cautiously groping his way through the obscurer and more densely interlaced stretches of the narrative. For the enjoyment of Mr. James's later style is something of a

discipline as well as a unique delight. His punctilious and elaborate adjustment of scene and character occasionally baffles wits dulled by the trite and easy. The *process*, however, of penetrating to a true understanding of an author's meaning is sometimes a necessary factor in a true appreciation, though it may unquestionably be too protracted. And the reward of the child who 'eats the letter' is in this case a reward indeed.

Autobiography is an art in which the amateur may excel. Its flowers have been easily persuaded to flourish on a soil consisting almost solely of *naïveté*. The most ingenuous record of life's earlier years in particular can make them vivid and illuminating. After that the old, old story, strictly chronological, of the steady climb, rung by rung, of the ladder of fame, makes a sufficiently absorbing entertainment. A humorous sally or two, a constellation of distinguished names to shed lustre upon its pages—an index for guide to where they shine—and the thing is complete. This is not Mr. James's conception of autobiography. His views are as deeply considered and as ripely original regarding this particular art, as his practice and criticism of fiction. His first volume, 'A Small Boy and Others,' was not merely the revelation of astonishing powers of penetration and receptivity in a child of imaginative genius. Memory was only its raw material. The selecting, arranging, proportioning, the placing and lighting, the surface, the tone, the imaginative atmosphere of its presentation—all this is the conscious elaboration of Mr. James's wonderful art. Most men think and remember by a system of labels, so to speak. Mr. James undoes the string of every parcel to which the label is attached, and 'goes through,' sorts, the tangled and miscellaneous contents. To experience the (probably harrowing) privilege of becoming a character in one of his novels, to witness the dissection and display of one's obscurer motives, second thoughts, finer shades (and even a great glare is surrounded by lesser glares) would be to anticipate something of the experience of the last dread ordeal of all. And as Mr. James deals with the people of his stories, so he dealt with the demure, 'gaping,' meekly vigilant, omnivorous 'small boy' of his first volume. So, too, to a certain extent he deals with the young man he once was in these 'Notes of a Son and Brother.'

But the doubtings and questionings, the pose, extravagance, and affectation of one's 'twenties' seem to maturity more unreal, farther away even than one's childhood.

Mr. James's direct treatment of his young manhood is therefore not only more objective; it is less close and less copious. None the less his quarry is still the remote 'impressions' of his youth—those 'dearest things in the world.' Here he is still tentatively reaching out to all such experiences, scrutinies, discriminations as were 'valuable as ministering 'to culture,' a culture which is 'a matter of attitude' quite as much as of opportunity. To the keen roving eyes of William, to that eager, protean, practical mind such an attitude might seem 'a little mildly—though, oh! *so* mildly—morose or 'anxiously mute.' Even his brother Wilky, Mr. James tells us, a far less coruscating and versatile figure than William, 'lived with an immediacy that left me far in the lurch.' But though in this volume, too, with his unfailing insight and recreativeness, Mr. James gets well into the skin of the young man, Harry, he seems to speak of him at times almost as if he were yet another brother—a twin-brother, astonishingly rich in resemblances, but of a distinct identity. And it is this young man whom we watch being gradually initiated into the life of the imagination, steadily, though never quite consciously perhaps, evading a definite career, but none the less, slowly, irretrievably turning author.

Most great painters have painted their own portraits. And in nearly all such portraits we catch much the same deep look of reverie mingled with the most searching apprehension. It is this piercing and at the same time brooding and speculative gaze that Mr. James directs on his numerous and various 'subjects,' whether of scene or character. The essential truth about any man, as witnessed by an observer too anxious for that truth's sake to be 'sympathetic,' is always the very best that can be said of him. And when Mr. James has for 'sitter,' for original, the figure and personality of his father, every word that reveals him to the reader of these Notes, whether it is of tender and reverential commentary and evaluation, or whether it is derived from the freshness and fulness of his own letters, makes him the more winning and dignified, wise and human, loyal-hearted and lovable. Here, indeed, his anxious biographer is justified of his beautiful thought:

'Poetic justice, when it comes, I gather, comes ever with a 'great shining.' That shining in certain cases may take the form of an urbanity, which expresses not so much 'cutting' as exterminating judgments—such judgments as the Seraphim at the valley gates of Eden did not express but reserved, as it were, beneath a fixed implacable gaze of exile. But a gentle, incessant rain of humour, like the endless, vivid bombardment of space proceeding from a grain of radium, redeems most such judgments from severity. And a whimsical tenderness, with no vestige of any sacrifice to the naked facts of the case, suffuses more than one figure whose brilliant morning sun went down in cloud, and particularly that extremely engaging relative who was 'quite the most emphasised of all our wastrels.'

'O the cold grey luminaries hung about in odd corners and 'back passages, and that we have known shining and warm!' . . . 'Upon these faint sparks in the night of time would I 'gently breathe, just to see them again distinguishably glow, 'rather than leave their momentary function uncommended.' In that serene night of the past, as it is recorded in this volume, dwells in exquisitely clear and solitary radiance one who was never to fulfil her lovely promise, and never, too, to suffer any possibility of life's eclipse—that 'young and shining 'apparition,' Mary Temple.

'If I have spoken of the elements and presences round about us that "counted," Mary Temple was to count, and in more lives than can now be named, to an extraordinary degree. . . . She was really to remain, for our appreciation, the supreme case of a taste for life as life, as personal living; of an endlessly active and yet somehow a careless, an illusionless, a sublimely forewarned curiosity about it, something that made her, slim and fair and quick, all straightness and charming tossed head, with long light and yet almost sliding steps and a large light postponing, renouncing laugh, the very muse or amateur priestess of rash speculation.'

In the beauty and dignity of Mr. James's art, in her own bravely gay, bravely frank, wise and penetrating letters, she lives again, in all the originality, vivacity, audacity, generosity, of her rare and haunting spirit. So lives again, each in his own vital fashion, every member of Mr. James's wide circle. When, indeed, what is rapidly becoming the antiquated ideal of the family is entirely obsolete, this record will remain its gracious and enduring memorial.

Grave national events vaguely resound in Mr. James's pages, including 'the boom of the far-away guns of Gettysburg.' Wilky sends home spirited and graphic tidings of the war. The assassination of Lincoln makes a solemn surge and eddy in this placid, voluminous, all-reflective current. It is, as we have said, because these Notes are kept ever in one full, large, steady stream, because every recounted event, every transient personality is given its due pitch, its true form and significance, and its precise relation in this complete retrospective review, that this, like all Mr. James's books, is a work of art, the revelation of a managed and mastered genius, and not, as are most volumes of reminiscence, a mere pie for the exploitation of an uncritical Jack Horner. Not that plums do not abound, nor that a reasonable curiosity is disappointed of its harvest of expected notabilities. Emerson, Hawthorne, Carlyle, George Eliot, Rossetti, Darwin—each is accorded a nicely disposed niche amid these gravely coloured trophies of the past. Let an unforgettable glimpse of Dickens be taken for a needless surety of Mr. James's liberality in this direction. The date is November, '67; the hour, after dinner; the place, the Eliot Nortons at Shady Hill:

'I can imagine no actual young person of my then age (Mr. James was then twenty-four) and however like myself so ineffably agitated, so mystically moved, in the presence of any exhibited idol of the mind who should be in that character at all conceivably "like" the author of Pickwick and of Copperfield. . . . I saw the master—nothing could be more evident—in the light of an intense emotion, and I trembled, I remember, in every limb, while at the same time, by a blest fortune, emotion produced no luminous blur, but left him shining indeed, only shining with august particulars. It was to be remarked that those of his dress, which managed to be splendid even while remaining the general spare uniform of the diner-out, had the effect of higher refinements, of accents stronger and better placed, than we had ever in such a connection seen so much as hinted. But the offered inscrutable mask was the great thing, the extremely handsome face, the face of symmetry, yet of formidable character, as I at once recognised, and which met my dumb homage with a straight inscrutability, a merciless *military* eye, I might have pronounced it, an automatic hardness, in fine, which at once indicated to me, and in the most interesting way in the world, a kind of economy of apprehension.'

There (with shades even finer yet for which our small canvas is inadequate) is the 'so exquisitely complicated image' of

'this particular and prodigious glimpse.' All of which, adds Mr. James, 'I recount for illustration of the force of action, 'unless I call it passion, that may reside in a single pulse of 'time.' It is, indeed, to put it crudely, this insistence on quality and intensity, in an age of lax and amorphous quantity, that is the note of these reminiscences. Their fidelity to the subtler and rarer humanities of life rather than any speculative adventurousness is no less clear. Compared with what is here retrieved and gently persuaded to endure the searching shine of a profoundly poetic justice, how barren seems one's own poor, small record. But then again, as these Notes so bountifully prove, it is the attitude that counts quite as much as the opportunity.

In a letter from Geneva in 1860 to a friend in Paris, Henry James the elder, while grateful for large mercies, declares that all that America then needed 'to make her right' was simply an intelligent recognition of her spiritual whereabouts. 'You and I,' he went on, 'when we get home will try to 'quicken her intelligence in that respect, will do at any rate '*our* best to put away this pestilent munching of the tree of 'knowledge of good and evil, and persuade to the belief of 'man's unmixed innocence.' In 1860 Walt Whitman's 'Leaves of Grass' was already in its third edition. And though Mr. Basil de Sélincourt in his critical study of this bewildering poet considers such crude speculations quite unnecessary, this apt and contemporaneous passage cannot but set one wondering whether Whitman at this late day actually does so persuade us, wondering too precisely what, after his first terrific onset, he does to quicken the intelligence. Mr. Henry James himself seems not to have met his compatriot face to face. He refers incidentally to the elegiac strain of 'Drum Taps,' and relates (a little elusively) that he himself indulged the American soldier 'in his multitude' with substantial sympathy, 'if indeed he had not positively 'anticipated dear old Walt,' though he hadn't come to Portsmouth Grove armed like him 'with oranges and peppermints.' To Mr. Gosse's 'Critical Kit-Kats' we must go for the vividest possible impression of Whitman's precise aspect and effect. They met at No. 328 Mickle Street, New Jersey, in 1884. A melancholy woman opened the door; a large, cheery figure

hobbled down the stairs; and suddenly by some magnetic charm, all wire-drawn literary reservations faded out of being and Mr. Gosse had found a friend in this 'nice, old 'gentleman.' They sat and talked in a carpetless room, its floor scrubbed to 'the *n*th power of stainlessness,' with a stove and a stack-pipe in the middle, one chair, mountains of papers, and rows of pegs and shelves and boxes. Whitman at once passed into a state of absolute passivity. 'If it be 'true that all remarkable human beings resemble animals, 'then Walt Whitman was like a cat—a great old grey Angora 'Tom, alert in repose, serenely blinking under his combed 'waves of hair, with eyes inscrutably dreaming.' His talk was elemental—about himself, his poverty, his paralysis, his love and longing for light and air, his adoration of athletes, his eager desire for Spring to come again. He mumblingly intoned a new poem, and, apropos of some recent tribute from India, remarked 'with a twinkling smile': 'You see 'I "sound my barbaric yawp over the roofs of the world."'

Mr. Basil de Sélincourt's study is for the most part strictly literary. He lays little emphasis on the oranges and peppermints, on the barbarism of that yawp. He has made the closest possible survey of Whitman's complete writings, a feat in itself of a rare devotion. He has discovered unwritten laws of form, constructive principles, and a prevailing unity, where even enthusiastic admirers of the poet have hitherto perceived little else but caprice, licence, and an almost anarchic revolt against tradition. He has closely examined and to some extent vindicated a naked candour concerning 'man's 'unmixed innocence' that may have transitorily engrossed, but has now lost all savour for a Mrs. Grundy, who is at least collaterally related to the family of Paul Pry. Finally, Mr. de Sélincourt sees in Whitman a national poet, the well-spring of national ideas, born out of due season; and hears in his 'Leaves of Grass' the voice of 'a culminating poet' crying in the wilderness of a comparatively virgin country—a voice, however, that provoked little attention, because all its inhabitants were chaunting at the same time more or less in unison. Mr. de Sélincourt meanwhile does not lose sight of the actual man, but his tendency, we think, has been to over-civilise, to over-mentalise, Whitman; to suggest that he had irrefutably sound and sufficient reasons for breaking

abruptly away from tradition—the tradition of a poetical form that was none the less elastic enough to admit the transcendentalism of Emerson, the music and fantasy of one of the two or three men of poetical genius that America has yet produced—Edgar Allan Poe.

Whitman began with verse of the usual pattern, and to judge from 'O Captain! My Captain!' or 'Old War Dreams,' indifferent verse it must have been. He felt, as most poets feel, that he had 'quantities' to say ('that which eludes this 'verse and any verse') and that he didn't quite know how to say it. 'The words of my book nothing, the drift of it every-'thing.' A darkness moved over the face of the waters. The petty moulds cramped him. He thought out, in the raw, new rules for his guidance, and the result was 'Leaves of Grass' —which he presented to an indifferent public with three ready-made reviews to assist its progress.

Irregular rhymeless verse was no new thing, though Mr. de Sélincourt spends little space on its previous practitioners. But as Whitman went on writing, he began to find his groove. The nearer he approaches beauty, the closer he gets to true form. As recitative is to melody so in a sense his verse is to lyric poetry. It is his voice that moves us, vibrant with his spontaneity, his almost feminine tenderness, his vague instinctive worship of the great simplicities of life, of man's rudimentary humanity, his delicious, mysterious, inarticulate joy in being alive in a world far too full of life and death, 'meals and 'minutiae,' of crowds and senators and steamships and Mississippis and bearded camerados and beautiful she-women, for him to understand. He states; he does not explain: no poet need. But there are various clarities, densities, auras in statements, and if we compare, say, a poem of Donne's with one of Whitman's panoramic prologue-catalogues, we realise the fact. There is something almost infantile in Whitman's childishness. He seems at times to be playing at poetry as a boy plays at Red Indians. He primevally hobnobs with Adam in the Garden, rhapsodically conscious that voices 'are around,' and in unmixed innocence beneath the everlasting and forbidden tree munches steadily at all the windfalls within reach. And he possessed all the beautiful qualities of his defects. Mr. de Sélincourt reveals with an ardour not the less impressive for being held in check the inchoate,

surging poetical feeling there was in Whitman, and with what beauty and mastery he at times expressed it. But he also endeavours—and very skilfully—to prove him a consummate artist. Latterday innovators will argue the question out. Meanwhile the shade of 'dear old Walt,' as friendly and lovable, and certainly as pictorial a figure as any in literature, awaits in patient ecstasy the coming of Spring.

Only the rarest poetry survives the passing day. As regards the work of living writers, it is impossible to anticipate a final verdict. It does not and need not concern us. So long as their poetry renews in us the sense of life and beauty, restores mystery to what custom has staled, sets heart and mind free awhile from the darkness and difficulties of a jaded world, we can put away our tapes and scales. Its maker must first have experienced this freedom and this renewal. And Mr. Ralph Hodgson's 'Song of Honour,' one of a series of richly embellished little chapbooks recently issued, records just such a sudden and vivid realisation of life. It tells how in the twilight and solitude of evening, on a hillside bare beneath the first stars, into a rapt stillness of scene and mood, broke in witchery an unearthly voice :—

'There, sharp and sudden, there I heard—
Ah! some wild lovesick singing bird
Woke singing in the trees?
The nightingale and babble-wren
Were in the English greenwood then,
And you heard one of these?

The babble-wren and nightingale
Sang in the Abyssinian vale
That season of the year!
Yet, true enough, I heard them plain,
I heard them both again, again,
As sharp and sweet and clear
As if the Abyssinian tree
Had thrust a bough across the sea,
Had thrust a bough across to me,
With music for my ear!'

And thus the poem sweeps on into its breathless and universal Benedicite. This same spirit reveals itself no less clearly but in differing degrees of impulse and intensity in 'New Numbers,'

the first of a series of collections of verse to be published quarterly by Wilfrid Gibson, Rupert Brooke, Lascelles Abercrombie, and John Drinkwater. The experiment alone proves their zeal and their courage. It is an assurance of promise as well as a marked achievement. But though the tide of poetry just now is running free and making for itself new channels, its sources have never failed, its impulse of obedience to some unearthly influence remains unchanged. And here is another volume to prove it. In the 'Collected Poems' of Mrs. Woods, even in those of them that are most deeply reflective and gravely burdened with thought, 'The Passing 'Bell,' The Builders,' it is life and not death, the overwhelming, chaotic rumour of the world without, rather than the solitary, immense, dark shrine of Westminster Abbey, that are her inspiration.

> 'Thou in the one communion of thy bosom
> Gatherest the centuries, their brooding silence
> Informs thy dark, a live incessant voice,
> London about thee clamours ephemeral things.
> And thou listenest to hear
> Its hidden undertone, thou art ever listening
> To the deep tides of the world under all the seas
> Drawing to thee, and the slow feet of fate.'

The many-sidedness of Mrs. Woods's work is apt to hide the rarest of her qualities. But everything that she has written—play, elegy, dialogue, lyric—shows not only a profoundly dramatic, penetrating and impetuous sense of life, a wide imaginative range, a masculine delight in thought with all a woman's warmth and quickness of sensibility, but reveals too, now in a glimpse, now in a complete poem, elfin or crazy and sinister, of the churchyard mould or of the white moonbeam, that queer, elusive thing we call magic. It is an insight—it may be a remote, lost sense—which the author of 'Wild Justice' shares with Emily Bronte, but—to such a degree—with no other woman of genius.

The second volume of 'Cathay and the Way Thither' consists of the narrative of the travels of Odoric, a Franciscan friar, born at Villa Nova in Pordenone in 1286. In his early thirties he set out on his wanderings through the Indies, China, and Thibet—Constantinople, Trebizond, Tabriz, Soltania,

Persepolis, Baghdad, Malabar, Ceylon, Sumatra, Java, Canton, Nanking, Peking, Lhása, and thence probably by Kabul to Tabriz, to Venice, and so home. At Padua, in May 1330, his brief and racy account of this prodigious pilgrimage was taken down and 'done into homely Latin' by William of Solagna. On his way to Avignon to make his report to the Pope, Odoric fell ill at Pisa. He returned to Udine and died there on the 14th of January 1331. With one accord the whole town rushed to his funeral in the convent church. His body was in danger of complete dismemberment into miraculous souvenirs. Supernatural interposition alone prevented one virago from snipping off his ear with her scissors. On the day following his burial his body was taken up again. The whole country was in a ferment. A noble shrine was prepared; Odoric's formidable array of miracles was formally placed on record; and, hundreds of years afterwards, on the 2nd of July 1755, the beatification of this incredibly way-worn, fearless, and credulous friar, who with his own hands had presented the Grand Cham with a trencher full of apples, was fully sanctioned by Benedict XIV. To this day his body (with the exception of one leg, long since frittered away into reliques) is exposed at Udine on every fourth recurrence of his festival.

In the Index to 'Astley's Voyages' (1745–7) the saint is thus entered:—'Odoric, Friar, Travels of, iv, 620a. *A great Liar. Ibid.*' From this unkindness Odoric has been rescued by Sir Henry Yule, who in 1866 edited his travels for the Hakluyt Society. In spite of incidental infirmities Odoric was a genuine traveller, the first European who distinctly and undoubtedly mentioned the name of Sumatra. His accounts of sago in the Archipelago, of leeches in the forests of Ceylon, of fishing with cormorants, of the custom of cramping the feet and extending the nails in China, of blow-pipes and poisoned darts, are peculiar to him among all the European travellers of his age. On the other hand, so skilfully and craftily did that perfidious romancer, Mandeville, steal from his record that Odoric is described by Sir Thomas Herbert merely as 'the travelling companion of our Sir John.'

'Like a humble child,' Odoric submitted himself on his death-bed 'to the keys of the church,' and so ingenuous is his narrative in its eager curiosity, impressionableness, in its

delight in the strange and the marvellous, that to read him is to recall the far-away childish experience of gloating into the lighted windows of an extremely brilliant confectioner's shop. 'Victuals,' indeed, figure richly in his remembrance. He bethinks himself of an excellent fruit called *mussi* he enjoyed somewhere, of excellent grown ginger, of a well-dressed and deliciously seasoned goose he fared on at Kansan—as fat as fat can be, and twice the size 'of ours.' He sagaciously adds approximate prices; four good partridges, or an ass-load of rhubarb, or forty-two pounds of dates, all for less than a Venetian groat. He knows how to condense, how to seize on the essential:—'And here they burn the brazil-wood for fuel 'and in the woods are numbers of wild peacocks.' He knows how to tickle and intrigue the fancy:—'And many other 'strange things are there which it would be pretty to hear 'tell'; or 'Marvellous and beastly customs which it is 'just as well not to write.' He enjoys his fun. Eastward over the Ocean Sea he sailed from the cannibal island of Dondin to the noble province of Manzi (of two thousand great cities); here were bread, wine, rice, flesh, fish and all manners of victuals in plenty, and no beggars: and here, he goes on, 'the men, as to their bodily aspect, are comely 'enough, but colourless, having beards of long, straggling 'hairs like mousers—cats, I mean. And as for the women, 'they are the most beautiful in the world!' How delicious, too, is his hearty burst of laughter at the monk in the shrubbery of grottoes with his buckets full of scraps, and his gong wherewith to summon his thousands of all kinds of apes and monkeys ('with the souls of gentlemen') to their breakfast 'in regular ranks!'

Odoric exults in kings with really royal families of children, 200 or so; and wives to match. 'Great and terrible things' return to his memory like harmless nightmares to the waking mind—the valley of sand, for instance, over against the River of Delights, with its corpses, its face of appalling terror in the rock, its spectral makers of marvellous music, its useless silver, heaped up as it had been fish scales. And how one's pleasure in his wonders—his lamb-cradling melons, his woolly hens—is aided by a dash of scepticism regarding other men's:—'As regards Prester John, not one hundredth part is true 'of what is told of him as if it were undeniable.' The

Great Khan of Cambalech—the Kublai of Xanadu of Marco Polo—is Odoric's set piece, with his fountains and gardens and splendour and divinest rights; above all, with his manner of journeying, drawn in state from one amazing palace to another, by elephants and horses, in a coach of lign-aloes and gold and skins and gems, hawking out of its windows as he goes, and for guard, an army of horsemen skirring a day's march in front of him, an army of horsemen a day's march behind him, and armies on either hand. But a fact fully as fascinating and bizarre as anything of Odoric's is related in one of an immense number of learned and curious notes to these travels; that the stately pleasure-dome of Coleridge's dream-poem was not only decreed by the Great Khan, Kublai, but actually built by his Chinese architects to the design of one which he himself had seen in sleep.

WALTER DE LA MARE.

THE CROWN COLONIES AND PROTECTORATES

1. **Speeches by the Right Hon. L. Harcourt**; House of Commons, June 27, 1912, and July 31, 1913.
2. **The Nation and The Empire.** By VISCOUNT MILNER. Constable. 1913.
3. **King's College Lectures on Colonial Problems.** Edited by Professor F. I. C. Hearnshaw. Bell. 1913.
4. **The Advance of our West African Empire.** By C. BRAITHWAITE WALLIS. Unwin. 1903.
5. **The Making of Northern Nigeria.** By Captain C. W. I. ORR. Macmillan. 1911.
6. **A British Borderland.** By Captain H. A. WILSON. Murray. 1913.
7. **Africa in Transformation.** By NORMAN MACLEAN. Nisbet. 1913.
8. **The South African Scene.** By VIOLET R. MARKHAM. Smith, Elder. 1913.
9. **How I became a Governor.** By SIR RALPH WILLIAMS. Murray. 1913.

AT a meeting of the Royal Colonial Institute in June 1908 Lord Milner read a paper on 'The Two Empires,' grouping in one the self-governing Dominions, in the other India and the Crown Colonies, and calling attention to the advantages which must accrue to each from friendly relations and the interchange of their natural resources. At the same time he indicated the dangers which menace the very existence of the British Empire from the conflicting interests of the different races it contains. Two years later, in June 1910, Lord Milner made the Crown Colonies the subject of a special address to the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce. In view of their practically unlimited resources and possibilities he urged the importance of a thorough study of the administration of our Crown Colonies, not as isolated and unimportant adjuncts of our Imperial heritage, but as complementary and indispensable to the other parts of the Empire from an economic point of view, and destined to play a very essential part in

its development as a whole. Again two years later, on the 27th of June 1912, the Secretary of State, Mr. Harcourt, in opening his statement on the Colonial Office vote in the House of Commons, declared his intention of making a new departure by omitting all reference to the self-governing Dominions and devoting himself exclusively to what he called the *terra incognita* of the Crown Colonies and Protectorates, including in the term all British possessions except the self-governing Dominions and India. He justified this course on two grounds : first, that the events occurring in the Dominions and the policies by which they are directed are under constant survey and generally familiar to all students of Imperial affairs ; and secondly, because the Colonial Office has only a slight responsibility and no financial liability for their internal administration. Among questions of Crown Colony administration Mr. Harcourt enumerated ' representative government, ' finance, trades, agriculture, minerals, medicine, liquor, ' labour, land, railways, opium, and the like.' To illustrate his theme he took the Committee on a tour, starting from the West Coast of Africa, across the Protectorates of Central Africa to East Africa, looking in at Mauritius, passing on by Ceylon to the Straits Settlements and thence *via* Hong Kong to our possessions in Central America and the West Indies. On the 31st of July 1913 Mr. Harcourt supplemented his review of the previous year by a general review of the natural resources of the Crown Colonies and Protectorates, and presented a fascinating picture of the sum of human happiness conferred by the development of these resources alike on the areas of origin and the areas of distribution. While disclaiming any desire to manufacture party or personal capital out of his review, Mr. Harcourt limited it to the period since the present Government came into power, illustrating the measure of progress of the whole by records of progress in detached administrative units.

The British Empire is an aggregate of scattered territories separated by oceans and continents, subject to every variety of climate, and comprising communities in every stage of economic and political evolution, evolution being understood as the operation of changing circumstances on unchanging environment. It includes one-fifth of the habitable surface of the globe, with more than one-fifth of its inhabitants, while the

natural factors of distinction between the temperate and tropical zones have determined a political classification into four main groups, shown approximately in this table :

	Area in Square Miles.	Population.
United Kingdom	120,000	45,500,000
Dominions	7,500,000	20,000,000
Crown Colonies	2,060,000	42,000,000
India	1,800,000	320,000,000

Excepting Gibraltar, Malta, and Cyprus in the Mediterranean, and the Falkland Islands in the Southern Atlantic, nearly all the Crown Colonies and Protectorates lie within the tropics, all within the heat-belt of the world bounded by the parallels of 30° north and south of the Equator. The Mediterranean islands are retained in the power of the Crown for the security of a trade route on which the commerce of all the constituent parts of the Empire depends, the South Atlantic islands for specific reasons arising out of their geographical position. On the other hand, the self-governing Dominions, with the exception of a considerable area of northern territory in Australia and a small area in Africa, lie in the temperate zones, the political cleavage between the self-governing Dominions and the Crown Colonies having followed the natural lines of cleavage between the temperate and tropical zones.

The Statistical Abstracts of the Board of Trade classify the trade of the Empire, apart from Bullion and Specie, as (1) Food, drink, and tobacco, (2) Raw materials and articles mainly unmanufactured, and (3) Articles wholly or mainly manufactured. The classification leads to much confusion in the discussion of fiscal questions, as it is impossible to draw a precise line of distinction between the three classes. The great staples of food of Crown Colony origin are imported largely as raw material of manufacture, and as contributions to industrial employment there is really no distinction between raw materials of food and raw materials of the textile industry, or of any other manufacturing industry. For the present purpose it must serve to classify the natural resources of the Crown Colonies under the general heads of agricultural and forest resources, mineral resources, and ocean and river resources.

In his review of the economic resources of the Crown Colonies and Protectorates Mr. Harcourt naturally assigned the first

place to cotton, showing that the export had nearly doubled in seven years, having increased from about 18,000,000 lbs. to 35,000,000 lbs., while the export of cotton-seed had risen during the same period from about 24,000 cwts. to 154,000 cwts. The increase was mainly from the Colonies and Protectorates of Africa.

In order to realise the full significance of this increased production it is well to recall the terms of the original prospectus of the British Cotton-growing Association, in which it was estimated that 10,000,000 of the people of this country are directly or indirectly interested in the supply of raw cotton.

> 'The objects of the Association are of national importance, closely affecting not only spinners, manufacturers, and operatives, but also dyers, printers, bleachers, finishers, and other allied trades. Merchants, shippers, and distributors are suffering severely: engineers, chemical manufacturers and colliery owners, machine-makers, bankers, lawyers, stockbrokers, insurance companies, railway companies, and shipowners are affected by depression in the cotton trade. Owners of property, shopkeepers, brewers, provision merchants, farmers, and in fact all wholesale and retail dealers in every branch of trade and all producers are concerned in it directly or indirectly.'

After referring to the fluctuations of price caused partly by shortage of supply, but mainly by 'corners in America' and 'gambles in futures in this country,' Mr. Harcourt expressed a hope that we shall in time become more independent of those 'accidental and deliberate interferences with the cotton 'markets of the world.' From this point of view it is interesting to note that in the year 1912 only 2·4 per cent. of our cotton imports came from British Possessions. Meanwhile the demand within the Empire for cotton goods is constantly increasing. Since Mr. Harcourt's statement was made, a report has been published in which it is stated that in the East African Protectorate the Kavirondo tribe, numbering a million, one of the few races whose men and women have hitherto gone about entirely naked, are now customers for European clothing, and that a period of rapidly increasing trade among the pagan tribes of equatorial Africa is expected.

In dealing with the development of the rubber industry Mr. Harcourt observed that from early youth to utmost age

rubber accompanies and alleviates our progress through life, adding that, though an increased production which lowers prices and profits may not be satisfactory to the investor or speculator, it is the production and export which make for the prosperity of the Colony and the remuneration of the native labourer. From this point of view Mr. Harcourt showed that the progress of our rubber production within the period of his review had been abundantly satisfactory, especially in Ceylon and the Malay Peninsula. A somewhat longer period of review is instructive. The first export of rubber from Ceylon was one package, of an estimated value of twelve shillings, in 1886; in 1912 the export amounted to 81,255 cwts., of an estimated value of £2,101,000. During about the same period the exports from the Malay Peninsula rose from a *quantité négligeable* to an annual value of over £10,000,000.

In Africa the rubber industry is still in its infancy, but the certain increase of production, with its consequences on the market price, has helped to draw attention to the question of new uses. The modern machinery of travel and transport by automobile carriage is largely dependent on the rubber industry; while the suggested use of rubber paving for roads means a practically unlimited demand. In June last Dr. Philip Schidrowitz delivered a lecture at the Chemical Engineering Exhibition in which he showed that, apart from road-work, there is scarcely an industry or trade in which novel or more extensive uses for rubber cannot be suggested. Architects and builders have scarcely yet awakened to the wide utility of rubber for constructional and decorative work; while the furniture and house-fitting trades might avail themselves much more largely than they do of the remarkable properties of the material. In the engineering trades, and particularly in connexion with the construction of plant and machinery, there are many openings. In the chemical industries rubber, even at the present prices, might be much more generally employed, the chemical manufacturers being scarcely alive to the potentialities of suitable and high-grade soft and hard rubbers. In the paint and varnish trade, in the fermentation industries, in the heating, lighting, and power industries many applications for rubber suggest themselves.

Closely allied with the rubber industries are the industries connected with gutta percha, a staple export from the Malay

Peninsula, and balata, a staple export from British Guiana, largely employed, among other uses, in connexion with the machinery of electrical engineering.

In an age which, in more senses than one, may be called the Age of Paper, it is interesting to note the extent to which the agricultural and forest resources of the tropics are complementary to the resources of the temperate zones in the production of materials for the manufacture of paper. The Imperial Institute has devoted much research to the manufacture of paper pulp from timber and fibres, and a recent number of the Institute's Bulletin has dealt with the growing importance of the bamboo, of esparto grass, of the waste remaining on cotton-seeds after removal of the lint, and of 'bagasse' or 'megasse,' the fibrous residue obtained after the extraction of the juice from the sugar-cane. Scientific methods of treatment are now bringing the bamboo into commercial prominence as a source of paper pulp, and the pulp can be produced at a cost which can compete in many markets with that obtained from the forests of the Dominions.

An Oriental proverb declares that there are a hundred varieties of palm, and each variety has a hundred uses. Among the multiple uses of various palms it must suffice to mention the principal uses of the coconut-palm and the oil-palm. The thick outer husk of the coconut is composed of densely packed fibres yielding the coir of commerce, largely employed as a rope and cordage material on account of its power to resist the action of seawater. The kernel, cut up and dried, is exported as copra and yields the coconut oil of commerce, which is of enormous value as an illuminant, in the manufacture of candles and soap, and for many other purposes.

The fruit of the oil-palm is a great cone containing many hundreds of nuts. The actual kernel is enclosed in a hard shell, but this shell is enclosed in a skin of about the consistency of that of a chestnut, and between this outer skin and the kernel there is a porous husk or packing, saturated with oil. The oil from the husk is expressed locally by boiling and maceration ; the oil from the kernels has never hitherto been expressed at the place of origin, but by crushing machinery in England. While the oil is largely used for lubricating and candle-making, its increasing value is mainly due to the demands of the soap

trade, and it was to meet these demands at reduced cost that a concession was recently granted to Messrs. Lever for the erection of machinery to crush the kernels *in situ*. Mr. Harcourt, in his legitimate defence of this concession, hardly did justice to the importance of its bearing on the question of the working man's interests in the economic development of the tropics. Other nuts, such as the cohune nut, are equally rich in oils, but have not been much used because of the difficulty of crushing them by local manual labour. The erection of local machinery will add largely to the tropical supply of vegetable oils to meet the multiple uses to which they can be put in this country; at the same time it will add largely to the employment of the British workman in the manufacture of machinery for export. With the abolition of slavery, and other economic changes, the cost of labour in production and local transport threatened to make the development of tropical resources unprofitable. The difficulty has been met to a very large extent by the substitution of mechanical agencies for the natural agencies of manual labour and animal draught; this in turn has created in the Crown Colonies and Protectorates a constantly increasing demand for agricultural and industrial machinery.

Scientific research has further increased the value of tropical resources by the discovery of various by-products. In July 1913 the 'Queensland Agricultural Journal' described a new system of machinery invented to obtain by-products from the accumulated waste of coconut husks in the copra industry, and similar inventions are rendering possible the utilisation of the waste that arises in the manufacture of various commodities from tropical fibres such as jute, hemp, aloe, ramie or China grass, and many others little known but of increasing use, such as kapok and zapupe.

But it is in the commodities classed in the Statistical Abstracts of the Board of Trade as food, drink, and tobacco that the discovery of by-products is of most outstanding value, by increasing the supply of articles that enter into the primary and constant consumption and use of every family in the United Kingdom, even the humblest. The category of foods and drinks includes, for the breakfast and dinner table, sugar, tea, coffee, cocoa, vegetable butters from an almost infinite variety of nuts supplying the legitimate, cheap, and wholesome margarine

of commerce, maize, rice, arrowroot, tapioca, sago, peas, beans, lentils, pepper and other spices, the ground-nut which supplies the bulk of the salad oil of commerce, bananas, pineapples, citron fruits, and nuts. It is claimed that the recent discovery of uses for new by-products of the banana is likely to involve a vast economic change in tropical cultivation. To these must be added the minor necessity of tobacco, and what may appropriately be called the major necessity of medical drugs. The increasing demand for these commodities represents nothing less than a revolution in the food and drink of the mass of the population. Mr. Harcourt spoke of the banana as having with advantage replaced the Early Victorian bloater. If we take the whole range of vegetable foods and non-alcoholic drinks, it may be said that the produce of the Crown Colonies and Protectorates has with advantage replaced the bacon, bloater, and beer of the Early Victorian era.

In the category of articles of food, sugar holds the first place, not only on account of its universal use, but by reason of the many subsidiary interests dependent on its cultivation, manufacture, and distribution. Alike in the field and in the factory, secrets that science has wrested from nature have been applied to the production of sugar. To the botanist is due the quite recent discovery that sugar-canes bear seed, and the discovery has opened a wide field of activity in raising new varieties of superior quality. To the chemist and chemical manufacturer falls the analysis of soils and the investigation of manurial requirements. The engineer's science and skill are invoked for the construction of elaborate systems of irrigation and for the transport of canes to the mill. In the mill itself the engineer and the chemist are associated in the various processes of crushing, clarification, filtration, concentration, crystallisation, centrifugalling, steam supply, and scientific control. All these processes are carried out by elaborate and costly systems of machinery, constantly improved by scientific inventions to reduce the cost of production. Again, the operations of the sugar mill involve further subsidiary interests associated with the by-products, molasses and rum ; the latter linking up the sugar industry with the distillery. The local manufacture of sugar completed, the imported sugar becomes the raw material of refiners, confectioners, jam and sweetmeat makers, and allied industries.

Mr. Harcourt described the development of the cacao industry as an unmixed advantage to the merchant, a blessing alike to the native labourer and to the people of this country, who find in the products of the cacao bean at once a food and a beverage producing neither stimulation nor inebriation. The imported bean is at the same time also the raw material of a vast domestic industry. The stages of manufacture include sorting and cleaning, roasting, breaking and shelling, grinding, adding sugar and spices, moulding and packing. All these processes are carried on by elaborate systems of machinery.

Another valuable series of products is supplied by the essential oils used in perfumery and extracted from flowers, fruits, grasses, and woods of tropical origin. They include ylang-ylang, vanilla, clove, pimento, a whole series of citrine oils, cinnamon and nutmeg oils; and in the wood series eucalyptus, camphor, and sandal oils. There can be no doubt that in the Crown Colonies and Protectorates there is a large field for an extension of the area of cultivation of plants yielding essential oils. Allied to the cultivation of such plants, but of infinitely superior importance, is the cultivation of agricultural and forest resources yielding medical drugs such as cinchona. It may be added, as illustrating the beneficent results of the extension of the cultivation of cinchona, that within a very few years the price of quinine fell from twenty shillings to one shilling an ounce. In respect of the medical requirements of the Crown Colonies, it is by much the most important of all the drugs included in the British Pharmacopœia. In the domain of chemical research no enterprise of more imperial importance is now in hand than the revision of the British Pharmacopœia so as to make it an Imperial Pharmacopœia by the inclusion of drugs of proved efficacy of Indian and Colonial origin.

In the course of his review Mr. Harcourt spoke of tobacco as a minor vice. It is more polite to smokers to call it a minor necessity. He showed that during the period under review the export of tobacco from our Crown Colonies had risen from a value of £414,000 to £764,000. Tobacco cultivation is well established in Nyasaland, and experimental cultivation is being actively carried on throughout our Colonies in Western, Central, and Eastern Africa.

In linking vegetable and mineral oils in the order of his review Mr. Harcourt observed that the connexion was natural but not scientific. It is more scientific than he seemed to suppose. This was well shown in a paper read at a meeting of the Colonial Institute by Mr. Cunningham Craig in 1906, in which he said :

' Slowly accumulated deposits of more or less decayed vegetable matter are the origin of all the carbonaceous and bituminous minerals of Trinidad, and the particular mineral found in any locality depends merely upon the conditions the material has been subjected to since its accumulation. Thus, in many parts of the island, seams of lignitic coal are found associated with carbonaceous shales and beds full of fossil wood and leaves, while in other localities fossilised vegetable matter is entirely absent, but the strata are found to be saturated with petroleum. Coal or lignite, manjak, pitch and oil all have a common origin.'

Mr. Craig estimated that Trinidad has an oil-field of at least 500 square miles, with possibilities of output which might well prove of importance not only to Trinidad but to the Empire. The motor industry and the substitution of mineral oil for coal as fuel for ocean and river transit have given the oil-fields of Trinidad an importance not previously realised. Surveys of the oil resources of the Empire are now being undertaken ; but the scientific development of the mineral resources of the older Crown Colonies is as yet only in its infancy, and in Central and Eastern Africa the surface has hardly been scratched.

In speaking of gold Mr. Harcourt observed that British Guiana continues to be a diminishing field. This is not the result of diminished resources but of diminished enterprise. Writing in the ' Mining Journal ' in 1904 Mr. E. G. Braddon declared :

' The Guiana alluvial goldfields are possibly the richest existing to-day. . . . These goldfields are, further, the most extensive of the world. The payable fields already proved cover upwards of one thousand square miles, whilst a great part of the colony remains still unprospected. The volume of worked ground, which can all be profitably reworked by properly devised hydraulicking, is unimportant in relation to that which remains untouched, even on the established fields. . . . The possibilities of discovering lode forms of deposits are very real and attractive. . . . The colony has the elements for a very large development of hydraulic mining and dredging, which should directly lead to the discovery

and be accompanied by the opening of valuable lode, or lode forms of deposits. . . . The circumstances are in every way favourable for the activities of private enterprise from outside.'

Since this was written about four thousand square miles of payable fields have been proved, but the prosecution of mining operations awaits capital and labour.

The development of the diamond industry stands in much the same position, although the output in 1911–12 was 7647 carats, more than double the output of the preceding year. Only in Ceylon, of all the Crown Colonies, have the gem resources been adequately developed. There are in the island over 7000 gem quarries and pits, yielding chiefly rubies, sapphires, and cat's-eyes. Of the baser minerals of Crown Colony origin Mr. Harcourt referred to tin, copper, lead, mica and plumbago, thorianite, and tungsten. The Malay Peninsula is the chief source of the world's supply of tin, but the industry is being rapidly developed in Nigeria. Mica is of value in connexion with electrical machinery, having a high electrical resistance, and as the only mineral which is at once transparent and fireproof. Plumbago or graphite is in demand for crucibles, lead pencils, and grate polishes; it is also used in connexion with mica powder as a lubricant and substitute for grease. The quite recent discovery of thorianite in Ceylon was one of the results of a survey undertaken by the Director of the Imperial Institute. Its chief use is in the manufacture of incandescent mantles, and its commercial value was stated by Mr. Harcourt to be £1500 per ton, while the chief use of tungsten is in the supply of filaments for tungsten incandescent lamps. Wolfram, a principal ore of tungsten, is now a product of importance in the Malay Peninsula.

Among the ocean resources of the Crown Colonies may be mentioned the products of the whale fishery, in addition to pearls, shells, corals and sponges. The recent demand for oil, and improved methods of dealing with the whale, by which practically the whole of the carcass is utilised, have led to a remarkable revival of the whaling industry. In addition to oil and whalebone, whale-meat meal made from the fresh fish is said to be a most wholesome and nutritious food. Whale guano is a valuable manure. The ocean and river resources of the Crown Colonies are naturally connected with their power resources. Vast as is their capacity for expansion in the domain

of agricultural, forest, and mineral resources, it seems probable that in their power resources they have an asset of even superior value. The great falls and cataracts on their rivers are being studied by electrical engineers and are already being used as sources of electrical energy, while on the other hand the application of electrical power to machinery is making constant progress. In South America the Kaieteur fall in British Guiana has a width of nearly 400 feet and falls vertically in one stream for a depth of 750 feet, nearly five times the height of Niagara, continuing to descend in a series of cataracts. It is estimated that there is here running to waste as much energy as is consumed in the cotton industry of Lancashire. In Africa the problem of utilising waterfall power for the purposes of modern civilisation is being studied, and the day may not be distant when Mount Elgon, with its fertile soil and healthy climate, will become the seat of an industrial community who will generate electrical power sufficient to serve half the territory of tropical Africa.

Mr. Harcourt's records of economic progress in the Crown Colonies and Protectorates, during the period he selected as covering the existence of the present Liberal Government, supply an interesting commentary on the colonial policy of both political parties in this country in the middle of the nineteenth century. In 1853, in a speech on the India Bill, Cobden, after reminding the House of Commons that a resolution of a Committee had many years before forbidden the extension of our territories in West Africa, added:

'When an adventurous gentleman, Sir James Brooke, went out and took possession of some territory on the coast of Borneo, the enlightened government of Sir Robert Peel and his colleagues resolutely resisted all attempts to induce them to occupy any territory there. Recently, when it was announced in this House that orders had been given to the admiral on that station that on no account should any fresh territory be acquired, the announcement was received with loud cheering. We had arrived at a point when public opinion, in this House and the country, would prevent any such thing; and I believe the leading statesmen on both sides would resolutely set themselves against any extension of our territory in tropical countries.'

The belief was amply justified. Ten years later a Select Committee of the House, with Sir Charles Adderley (afterwards Lord Norton) as chairman, was appointed to consider the state

of the establishments on the West Coast of Africa. Colonel Ord, R.E., who had been sent to report on the area of territory and jurisdiction of these establishments, gave evidence before the Committee to the effect that all the territory claimed as under British protection outside the forts was limited to so much of the beach as was not claimed by the Dutch. The forts had originally been established by chartered companies, authorised by the terms of their charters to hold and govern them *without acquisition of territory* for the purpose of promoting the trade in slaves and gold, a trade chiefly carried on by interchange of liquor and arms. When the abolition of the slave trade had ruined the chartered companies, the forts continued to be held by Government for the purpose of suppressing the trade they had been established to promote. The report of the Committee was followed by a resolution of the House :

'That all further extension of territory or assumption of government, or new treaties offering any protection to native tribes, would be inexpedient, and that the object of our policy should be to encourage in the natives the exercise of those qualities which may render it possible for us more and more to transfer to them the administration of all the governments, with a view to our ultimate withdrawal from all, except probably Sierra Leone.'

A few years later, in 1869, Sir Charles Adderley, who, in the meantime, had held the office of Under-Secretary for the Colonies under Lord Carnarvon and the Duke of Buckingham in a Conservative government, expressed the view of the Colonial Office on the general question of our relations to our tropical colonies in these terms :

'The advantage to England of such dependencies, which are now beginning to pay more of their own expenses, consists in their assistance to commerce, encouragement of enterprise, or in furthering or extending Imperial interests throughout the world. Such possessions the Sovereign of Great Britain holds for special purposes, and may, if these purposes cease to exist, abandon, cede, or exchange at any time, only fulfilling engagements made and securing interests created. They are not extensions of empire, like national settlements, which, if we only abstain from crushing them by protection and allow them to act as partners with ourselves, will retain a connexion of nationality with us for ever ; they are merely occupations for use, and may be alienated without any national severance.'

The passage is interesting as evidence of a clear conception of the conditions which have determined the present relations

between the Imperial Government and the self-governing Colonies or Dominions. As regards the 'occupations for use' the policy advocated, in the terms of the resolution adopted in the House of Commons, has been steadily pursued with a result diametrically opposite to the expectation that prompted it. The 'occupations for use,' including an empire in equatorial Africa approximately equal in area to the territories of the British Empire in India, and forming an organic system under the designation of Crown Colonies and Protectorates, have proved indispensable to commerce, to the encouragement of enterprise, and to the furtherance and extension of Imperial interests throughout the world.

From a record of the results of the economic development of the Crown Colonies and Protectorates to a consideration of the policy and the agencies which have brought them about, the transition is natural. The policy has been controlled by the recognition of three basic facts: (1) that the development of the material resources of the Crown Colonies and Protectorates is the only source from which revenues adequate to the maintenance of civilised governments can be derived; (2) that the material resources of the tropical world can only be developed by the labour of peoples adapted to tropical environments; and (3) that the labourer cannot in the long run be excluded from a share in the distribution and profits of the results of his labour.

The agencies of this policy fall naturally into two groups, economic and social.

The economic development of the Crown Colonies, to the mutual advantage of the constituent parts of the Empire, is the result of an intimate association and co-operation between two scientific agencies, the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew, the botanical headquarters of the Empire, and the Imperial Institute. The work of Kew falls under three heads. It provides a school of research and of scientific and practical teaching in agriculture and horticulture; a central depot, and a clearing-house. A principal function of Kew in the department of research and education has been the training of young men for appointments in Colonial botanic gardens and stations as curators and superintendents. Within the last few years Kew has studded British Africa with men capable of teaching natives the rudiments of tropical agriculture.

As a central depot, the Gardens carry on the work of identifying the species of economic plants best adapted to the climatic and other conditions of the various parts of the Empire. As a clearing-house, Kew receives from, and distributes to, botanic gardens throughout the Empire plants likely to form the foundation of new cultures. Plants from different parts of the Empire are received at Kew, nursed to recovery, repacked, and despatched to a new home. Among the larger enterprises have been the migration of rubber-producing trees and cinchona from South America to Asia and Africa—twin enterprises of happy omen. For many years Kew had been in association with the Crown Colonies through the agency of botanical institutions in the West Indies, Mauritius, Ceylon, and the Straits Settlements, but in 1898 this great central institution was brought into much closer association with the West Indies by the creation of a West Indian Department of Economic Botany, supported by Imperial funds, and placed in charge of an officer styled the Imperial Commissioner of Agriculture for the West Indies. In connexion with this Department, a system of botanic stations has been organised in the smaller islands in addition to the botanical establishments of British Guiana, Jamaica, and Trinidad. They serve as centres for the experimental cultivation of new plants, for diffusing accurate information, and as training institutions for the practical teaching of agriculture. They are the headquarters from which agricultural instructors are sent to give lectures and demonstrations bearing on the selection of land for economic plants and the whole process of cultivation, from preparing the soil to handling, packing, and marketing the produce in such a way as to secure the most remunerative price. These instructors carry the work of the station so far as possible into the rural districts, giving practical demonstrations to small proprietors on any farm or plantation convenient for the purpose. The Department promotes agricultural and horticultural teaching and training, not only in special schools, but in the garden plots connected with the ordinary routine of primary schools. The work of the Department is encouraged by exhibitions, and its methods and results are brought to the knowledge of the most isolated cultivators of the soil by the distribution of bulletins, handbooks, and leaflets.

Similar work is being carried on in the East through the agency of the Ceylon Agricultural Society, founded by Sir Henry Blake in 1904. The object of this society is to bring all classes, down to the smallest cultivators, into closer touch with the Government, with each other, and with the scientific staff of the Botanic Department. The central society is formed of all the members of the Legislature, some of the principal inhabitants, European and native, of each Province, and all the members of the staff of the Botanic Department. Local societies have been formed by voluntary action in every part of the island and affiliated to the Central Board of Agriculture. The work of the society follows closely the lines of the Department of Economic Botany in the West Indies, and, like that Department, finds a valuable auxiliary in the primary school system of the Colony. In Ceylon instruction in theoretical agriculture is given in all Government schools above the fifth standard, and the teachers are desired to make use of the plots of ground attached to their schools for practical gardening. The School Garden scheme in Ceylon has for its object not only to encourage the study of nature, as an essential part of school education, by practical training in horticulture, but to familiarise the rural population with new products and their uses. Chiefly through the agency of the Botanical Gardens, an infinite variety of exotic seeds has been supplied to the school gardens from India, Australia, and other parts of the Empire.

It is not surprising that at the present moment the West Indies should be endeavouring to develop their Department of Economic Botany by making it the nucleus of an Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture with a view to further development into a University, while at the same time the Ceylon Board of Agriculture is taking active measures to select Ceylon as the site of the proposed College. On the part of the West Indies it is claimed that the Island of Trinidad would provide a site in proximity to the great centres of research and education in Europe and America and to a large area of diverse cultivations under diverse conditions of climate, soil, and labour. It is urged that the West Indies have natural affinities to Europe and America, and that in any case Ceylon cannot provide a substitute for the University centres to which the West Indies look for co-operation. On the part of Ceylon it is

urged that proximity to the great planting areas in the Eastern tropics, in tropical Australia, in Mauritius and Seychelles, and in British East Africa is of greater importance than proximity to centres of research and training in Europe and America. It is urged that the climate is healthy, and that there are vast plantations of all kinds of tropical industries giving opportunities for studying estate work on the spot. Another advantage is claimed in the fact that the students would find themselves in contact with Tamils—a race of Indian agricultural labourers who have migrated largely not only into the East but into most tropical colonies. Ceylon has also the advantage of a system of Government Technical Schools, devoted to instruction in a wider range of subjects subsidiary to agricultural estate work. The claim of Ceylon has been strongly supported by Professor Dunstan, whose authority is unquestioned, but probably he would not desire to exclude the alternative of two Colleges of Tropical Agriculture, one in Trinidad and the other in Ceylon. Mr. Harcourt, in his statement in July last referring to this subject, expressed his sympathy with the proposal to establish a College of Tropical Agriculture. On the question of site he was reserved, and equally reserved on the question of financial support.

In the same speech Mr. Harcourt paid a well-deserved tribute to the work of the Imperial Institute, and expressed his belief that, great as its services have been in the past, the Institute has a future of even greater utility. By those who have had experience in the Colonies in recent years the value of the work of the Institute is highly appreciated; but in this country it is less well known to the general public and is apt to be obscured by the unfortunate early history of the Institute, which, in view of its complete reorganisation and recent achievements, deserves to be forgotten.

The discovery of the precise nature and value of thorianite, the new Ceylon mineral, and its commercial utilisation are due to the work of the Imperial Institute; the development of cotton cultivation in nearly every Colony, and of the utilisation of oil-seeds (especially in West Africa), are among many other subjects in which the work of the Imperial Institute has been conspicuously successful in assisting the commercial utilisation of colonial products.

The Scientific and Technical Research Department of the

Institute is now fully equipped and staffed for the conduct of inquiries and investigations, and the supply of information with reference to the production and utilisation of every tropical product. Without interfering with the work of the local Agricultural Departments whose operations it supplements, or trenching on the purely botanical functions of Kew, the Imperial Institute has established a Central Department for Investigation and Inquiry, which is useful alike to the Colonies and to British manufacturers. Its Exhibition Galleries, continually added to and improved, are an object lesson in the resources of every country of the Empire. The Institute is also becoming more and more the headquarters of societies which carry out auxiliary work of Imperial utility. The recent Parliamentary Reports of the Institute show, however, that its work is much impeded by want of room in the great building at South Kensington. Originally intended solely for Imperial purposes, at a crisis in its history a part of the building was assigned for offices for the University of London This arrangement has in recent years satisfied neither party, and it is satisfactory to learn that there is some prospect of the University of London being provided elsewhere with a separate building of its own. As soon as this has been arranged, the Government will be in a position to restore to the Imperial Institute that accommodation which at present is so urgently needed in order to extend and complete work which has been so well begun.

The ' Bulletin of the Imperial Institute ' has now a recognised position among tropical agriculturists and among manufacturers at home. The special reports on fibres, rubber, and other products, which are periodically published as Parliamentary Papers, are of great value. More, however, is evidently called for in the nature of publications on special subjects, and in work of the kind done by the Intelligence Bureau of the United States Department of Agriculture, so that the Institute may be not only a centre for research, but also a centre for the distribution of that trustworthy information respecting the commercial and industrial development of the Colonies which is more and more called for by those in the Colonies and by the mercantile community at home.

Subsidiary, but indispensable to the scientific and technical work of Kew and the Imperial Institute, are the agencies

of Imperial Communication. The Royal Commission sent to the West Indies in 1897 reported that facilities of transport were a necessary corollary to the establishment of a Department of Economic Botany. On their recommendation subsidised ocean services were established to connect the West Indies with the United Kingdom, Canada, and America, and the policy was rapidly extended to our insular Crown Colonies throughout the Empire. At the same time the policy of liberal expenditure on facilities of communication was extended to our continental Colonies and Protectorates. The initiative was due to Lord Ripon, who ordered the preliminary surveys, the energetic prosecution to Mr. Chamberlain. In 1898 there was not a mile of railway open to traffic in West Africa. Within five years nearly 500 miles were in working order in Sierra Leone, the Gold Coast and Nigeria, and the railway system of these colonies has now been extended to nearly 1000 miles, while in East Africa the Uganda Railway has been completed for a distance of 584 miles to Lake Victoria Nyanza. The financial results following the opening up of vast areas of agricultural, forest, and mineral resources have been astonishing, and have led to insistent demands for the construction of new lines to open up territories which we have seen to be about equal in area to the whole of British India. The question of meeting these demands has led to an interesting correspondence in 'The Times.' It is urged that the British Government should follow the examples of the South American Republics, who adopt the simple expedient of saying that if anyone will construct a railway from A to B the Government will guarantee a percentage on the cost. 'The said railway,' it is claimed, 'would be con-'structed; it would pay if the route were well chosen; and 'the Colony would be blessed by a railway paying its own 'way, bringing in its train an ever-increasing trade, and 'this without the Colony paying one penny towards the cost.' The blame for the neglect of this alleged simple plan is laid on the Crown Agents, whose duties include the carrying out of instructions received from the Colonial Office and the Colonial Governments in the matter of railway construction.

The plan advocated in the correspondence seems to be based on the assumption that there are plenty of companies anxious to lay out money in making railways in Crown Colonies if the

Government would only allow them. It is a complete fallacy. The experience of many years has proved that there are no companies ready to construct railways in a Crown Colony or Protectorate without a material consideration. The companies or individuals who have approached the Colonial Office have always demanded a land grant, or guarantee of interest, or some other concession, and when the matter has been gone into it has in every case been made clear that it would pay the Government better to make the line itself. In the case of Nyasaland the Foreign Office gave the construction of the railway to a company, paying by grants of land. The Colonial Office List shows that hundreds of miles have been and are now being built by the Crown Agents, acting under the authority of the Colonial Office, in Africa, Ceylon, the Malay Peninsula, and in other Crown Colonies. Another fallacy is that the *policy* of railway construction is controlled by the Crown Agents. They are merely agents for carrying out the policy of the Colonial Office. In the discharge of their duty they have reconciled efficiency with economy in a way that has contributed largely to establish the reputation of their department as an agency of the first importance in the economic progress of the Crown Colonies and Protectorates. The costly experience of Jamaica has had its value in indicating the advantage of conducting the work of railway construction under well-organised direct control rather than by means of contracts with private companies.

Facilities of communication by post and telegraph are corollaries to facilities of transport by land and sea. They have become indispensable to domestic, commercial, and political interests, the interests of navigation, and the supreme interests of defence. In his statement on the Colonial Office vote in 1913 Mr. Harcourt announced the reduction of the cable rate between the West Indies and the United Kingdom to 2*s.* 6*d.* a word, with a reduction of the interinsular rates by one-half. It was a step towards the full realisation of Mr. Chamberlain's efforts to bring the Crown Colonies and Protectorates within the orbit of an imperial system of cheap communication by post and telegraph. When we consider that half a century ago a charge of £20 for a message not exceeding twelve words was declared to be the irreducible minimum rate for a telegram between the United States and

the United Kingdom, there is hope that a penny-a-word telegram rate may be added to the penny postage rate.

The Crown Colonies and Protectorates, whose wonderful resources have been briefly reviewed above, are held by Great Britain in trust for populations adapted to their conditions of environment by the same natural laws as have conditioned the material resources of the environment. The terms of the trust, as stated in a proclamation issued by Queen Victoria in Natal in 1842, and considered as the Magna Carta of the coloured races in Africa, declare that 'there shall not in the eye 'of the law be any distinction of persons, or disqualification 'of colour, origin, language, or creed; but the protection of 'the law, in letter and in substance, shall be extended to all 'alike.' The terms are, in substance and spirit, identical with the terms of the trust under which we have constituted ourselves guardians of the rights and liberties of the Princes and peoples of India. Since the day of Mr. Harcourt's statement in the House of Commons on the Colonial Office vote in 1913, he has again and again been reminded of the conflict between the terms of the trust under which India and the Crown Colonies and Protectorates form constituent parts of the British Empire, and the legislation of the self-governing Dominions, which recognise no such equality of rights within their jurisdiction. The conflict is tending to divide the constituent parts of the Empire into water-tight compartments; and recent events in South Africa are forcing into the domain of practical politics the question 'What is to happen if the 'obligations of Great Britain, as trustee of the rights and 'liberties of India and the Crown Colonies, clash with the 'interests of the Dominions in matters of fundamental import-'ance?' There can be no doubt that clashing interests have arisen out of the development of the natural resources of the Crown Colonies and Protectorates, inasmuch as the industrial development of the Dominions in temperate zones is becoming more and more dependent on the natural products of the tropical and sub-tropical zones. The problem of the century is the administration of the trust under which the Crown Colonies and Protectorates are held by methods which, recognising the interdependence of the constituent parts of the Empire, shall serve the interests of all.

CHARLES BRUCE.

THE NAVY AND THE FUTURE

1. **Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty explanatory of the Navy Estimates, 1914-1915.** (Cd. 7302.)
2. **Naval Warfare.** By JAMES R. THURSFIELD, M.A. Cambridge University Press. 1913.
3. **Notre Défense Maritime.** Par J. L. de LANESSAN. Paris: Félix Alcan. 1914.
4. **Deutschlands Flotte im Entscheidungskampf.** Von RUDOLF TROELTSCH. Berlin: Mittler. 1914.

THE complete and final dependence of the British Isles and the British Empire upon power at sea is the truth which lies at the base and origin of all our Naval policy. It is a truth that began with the beginning of the nation, and has been manifested throughout our history; the knowledge of it is rooted in the instinct of our people, and it is still our most important concern. The grave affairs of Ulster and the campaign about the land may resound more loudly in the market-place and upon the hustings, but even they are as chaff in the wind compared with the vital and enduring problems of the sea. For us, power to command the sea is as the breath of life. The possession of this power means security, and the failure of it annihilation. Compared with it, all national things else are unimportant. Without its protection we should be as a fortress beleaguered, and ultimately compelled to surrender, as nineteen out of twenty fortresses have done, to the empty maw of famine. Last year 84 per cent. of the wheat we consumed came from oversea. Not only grain but fish, meat, and dairy produce come into the country in enormous quantities. With them comes also the raw material of many of our manufactures, and in return we send out across the sea completed manufactures, the work of British hands and brains in factory and workshop. And for the security of all we depend upon the guardianship of the fleet.

We depend not less upon the Navy to keep our shores inviolate from the footstep of the invader. Strategical heretics who suggest or assert the contrary are a danger to the State.

The rugged writer of five hundred years ago who likened England to a city and the sea to its wall; Shakespeare in a passage of rare beauty; Bacon in a classic phrase; Raleigh in sounding words; Hawke, Howe, Jervis and Nelson by their acts; and the unbroken record of nearly a thousand years, place this matter beyond the question or cavil of reasonable men. In the larger sphere, too, we know that, as the Empire grew by sea power, so by sea power must it be maintained. 'As long as British superiority at sea is assured,' to quote Lord Kitchener, 'then it is an accepted principle that no British 'Dominion can be successfully and permanently conquered 'by an organized invasion from oversea.' Rear-Admiral Sir Charles Ottley says truly, in an introduction to Mr. Thursfield's admirable volume cited above, that Englishmen 'realise, 'more or less reluctantly perhaps, that a decisive British defeat 'at sea under modern conditions would involve unspeakable 'consequences, consequences not merely fatal to the structure 'of the Empire, but destructive also of the roots of our national 'life, and of the well-being of almost all individuals in these 'islands.'

These considerations are elementary, and they should be commonplaces with all of us. Obviously they imply a doctrine and a policy; but we should go but a very short way into the naval problem if we merely accepted these naked facts, and did not, as practical people, consider how they affect and are affected by the preparations of other Powers. At the outset we are confronted by the formidable fact that in varying degrees other nations, with whom we have no cause of quarrel, consider a navy, which we regard as the prime condition of our own welfare, to be vitally necessary for the protection of the interests they also have to secure.

Among these nations the most important assuredly is Germany. The growth of the German navy has affected us financially by compelling us to increase our Navy Estimates by over £22,000,000 since the year 1900. Nevertheless we have no right to assume that the German navy has been built up with any directly aggressive purpose against this country. The object of the German navy is to secure Germany from the interference or aggression of a stronger Power. The German navy has grown with the growth of national spirit in Germany and with the consciousness of necessity. The increase of manu-

ures, the expansion of foreign commerce, the progressive change which is converting Germany from an agricultural into an industrial country, and the development of German interests throughout the world, are the causes of the growth of the German navy. At every stage of the Navy Law the necessity of undisturbed sea communications has been enforced by facts, figures, and arguments in an extensive literature.* That strong seaman-statesman, Grand-Admiral von Tirpitz, has created, not merely the navy, but the public opinion and the practical means on which its creation depended. The obdurate Reichstag, which was wont to reject votes for new ships year after year, has been subjected to the influence of a dominant will and a far-seeing judgment, and the Emperor and his Naval Secretary have been at one in unresting work to attain the object in view.

Those British politicians who regarded the Navy Law as embodying a paper programme, subject to change, displayed only their own ineptitude. They knew neither the nature of that law nor the character of the German people. When the Reichstag objected to particular votes in the Navy Law of 1900, the Grand-Admiral struck out certain cruisers, saying he would ask for them later on, which he did by the amendment of 1906, and lo! instead of six armoured cruisers, which might have been designed at an earlier time, there are six battle-cruisers, veritable capital ships, such as we had begun to build. Another significant point may be noticed. We had ceased to build armoured cruisers, and the Germans followed our lead, so that the twenty 'large cruisers' of the Navy Law will be battle-cruisers also. A little later, in 1908, when, by our great advance in ship design, we had accelerated the obsolescence of types, the Grand-Admiral curtailed the *Lebensdauer* of battleships from twenty-five years to twenty

* The following may be mentioned: 'Die Seeinteressen des Deutschen Reichs,' 1897; 'Altes und Neues zur Flottenfrage' and 'Neue Beiträge zur Flottenfrage,' 1899; 'Die Steigerung der deutschen Seeinteressen von 1896–98,' 1900; 'Die Entwickelung der deutschen Seeinteressen im letzten Jahreszehnt,' 1905; also the following in the semi-official annual 'Nauticus': 'Politische Machtstellung und Kriegsmarine,' 1900; 'Das Erstarken der Völker zur See,' 1901; 'Weltpolitik und Seemacht,' 1903; and 'Zehn Jahre Flottengesetz,' 1910.

years—an inevitable modification—thus causing several new ships to be laid down. And finally, after the Morocco incident, he added in 1912 more ships to his programme.

We are thus confronted with a condition of affairs in which the prime necessities for our security are, or may be, endangered by a fleet which is thought by the Germans to be essential to their security partly, or even mainly, against ourselves. This is the riddle of statesmen. Its solution might well have formed, as Sir Thomas Browne said in another relation, 'an excellent *quære* to have posed the devil of Delphos.' The *Englische Gefahr* has played its part in Germany in stimulating agitation, just as the German bogey has done the like in this country. But the Germans do not any longer apprehend direct attack from us. The wild spirit of adventure that moved our soldiery at the time of the Morocco incident they know to be dead. What the Germans really fear, and fear very much, is the growing strength of their Continental neighbours on either hand. Those who have their finger on the pulse of German public opinion are well acquainted with this apprehension. A recrudescence of impassioned national feeling amongst the French, impelling them to march, under the inspiration of some strong leader, for the recovery of the provinces which were lost in 1871, is a constant peril oppressing the German mind. The recent agitation in the German press, the meaning of which was at first misinterpreted in this country, at the intended increase in the strength of the Russian army and the rumoured imminence of a general test mobilisation, was but an indication of the extreme but not unnatural nervousness of the German people. The astonishing rise of the Russian navy is also watched with the liveliest apprehension by German statesmen. They see that Admiral Grigorovitch, having at last won confidence for the Russian Naval Administration, has entered upon plans which are truly organic and affect every part of the naval system—plans that will place in the Baltic, probably this very year, four 'Dreadnoughts' with four or five pre-'Dreadnoughts,' and armoured cruisers and auxiliaries of every kind. In 1916 four more 'Dreadnoughts' will be added; and in 1920 the number of Russian 'Dreadnoughts' will be brought up to sixteen, with cruisers, destroyers, submarines, and all the auxiliaries of a great fleet.

Germany is thus in a highly dangerous situation, with a *Nachbar am Osten* who is an immeasurable peril, and a *Nachbar am Westen* who may any day, it is conceived, break out upon the pathway of war. And in all her difficulties and all her efforts Germany has seen or imagined English influence arrayed against her. It is often said by Germans that our friendship with France and Russia, even if it do not move us to take any active part in a struggle, may yet give moral support to purposes of aggression. This is a view of the *Entente Cordiale* which prevails widely in Germany, and it would be folly not to take note of it.

That there is apprehension in France also requires no demonstration. Suspicion between the two countries has been carried to a high pitch. Almost daily it is reflected in the French press. The people have been moved by a great fear and a strong national impulse. The German army increase is being met by a French army increase and a recurrence to a three years' service. Already, upon plans initiated by Admiral Boué de Lapeyrère, and pursued by his successors at the Ministry of Marine, the building of a great modern navy has been put in hand, which, by the year 1920, will give France a fleet consisting of thirty-eight battleships, of which at least sixteen will be 'Dreadnoughts' and six 'Dantons,' with six armoured cruisers, fifty-two destroyers, and ninety-six submarines.

Germany, Russia, and France are thus hastening on in their rivalry of armaments, and they are doing so for their own purposes, and naturally without any concern for the sacrifices which they are, or may be, imposing upon the ancient Mistress of the Seas. For good or ill, the things which are for our peace—for our welfare and security—are cast into a balance that is new. The allies of Germany in the Mediterranean, Italy and Austria-Hungary, are moved by a similar impulse to naval expansion, and even Turkey and Greece, for reasons which, it must be admitted, are conclusive to themselves, are seized by the same fever of maritime competition. We shall speak more particularly of the Mediterranean situation in what follows. But here we may draw attention to the grave reflection which arises from the new situation in Europe. It is that England, whose whole life and well-being, and whose very existence as an independent nation, are bound up with sea

security, can perhaps never again hold the same relative superiority, involving absolute supremacy, which for centuries has been hers. 'L'océan ne comporte qu'un maître,' said a French Admiral. How shall that master exert his power if others question and some dispute his mastery? There must surely be some balance of sea power, as there is a balance of land power, and how that is to be secured so as to render our country safe is the gravest problem for this generation of Englishmen.

Of one thing we may be certain. The country must prepare itself to sustain a greater burden than before. The most we can accomplish is to prepare for every probable combination, and that in itself will place the severest strain upon our resources. We may be supported in the effort by the reflection that an insufficient Navy will prove incalculably dear, while one that is efficient will be cheap, however costly it may be. Our Navy Estimates have greatly increased. The sum of £51,550,000, which is the estimate for 1914–15, represents a net increase of £5,241,000 upon the original estimate for 1913–14, and is more than double the amount taken in 1898–9.

Many writers have deplored the 'organised insanity of 'bloated armaments,' but it is noteworthy that some of them are the same persons who speak of the abounding prosperity of the country. That they are right on the second point is indisputable. Some measure of the increase in our national wealth is given by the rise of gross income-tax assessments within the last ten years from £902,700,000 to £1,150,000,000. Our outlay on social 'betterment,' much of it improvident, impoverishing some and pauperising others, is increasing much more rapidly than that on naval defence. Nor has British naval expenditure increased in anything like the same proportion as that of other countries. An instructive diagram in the 'Daily Graphic' of January 17, 1914, showed that while naval expenditure, including expenditure out of loans, had risen from £40,300,000 in 1904–5 (with a fall in 1908 and 1909) to £46,300,000 in 1913–14 (since increased to £48,800,000 by a supplementary estimate), national expenditure on other than naval and military objects had grown from £79,800,000 to £124,100,000. The expenditure on old age pensions, labour exchanges, national health insurance and unemployment insurance, has risen by leaps and bounds, as the following

figures show: 1908–9, £2,000,000; 1909–10, £8,500,000; 1910–11, £9,800,000; 1911–12, £11,800,000; 1912–13, £17,000,000; 1913–14 (estimate), £20,400,000. As to the naval expenditure, the following brief table, compiled from the House of Commons Return 'Naval Expenditure (Principal 'Naval Powers),' 1913, including expenditure from loans under the Naval Works Acts, shows the comparative increase, and it must be remembered, not only that we depend for our *personnel* wholly upon voluntary, well-paid service, but that the growing expenditure includes charges for pensions, coast-guards, and other matters which are not included in the outlay of some other Powers. In the British figures of 1913–14 the Supplementary Estimate is included.

COMPARATIVE NAVAL EXPENDITURE.

(Millions of pounds sterling.)

—	1904–5.	1913–14.	Increase between 1904–5 and 1913–14.	
			Absolute.	Per cent.
Great Britain . . .	£41·1	£48·8	£7·7	19
France	12·4	20·8	8·4	68
Russia . . .	11·9	24·2	12·3	103
Germany . . .	10·1	23·0	12·9	128
Italy	5·0	10·2	5·2	104
Austria-Hungary . .	2·6	6·0	3·4	131
United States . . .	20·2	29·5	9·3	46
Japan	2·1	9·9	7·8	371

The British Navy Estimates, 1914–15, representing 51·5 millions, show an increase of 10·4 as compared with 1904–5, while the German Estimates, 24·3 millions, show in the same period an advance of 14·2 millions.

It is not with a light heart that any of us see warlike expenditure increasing to unparalleled figures. True economy is the very soul of efficiency, and it will not be attained unless we possess a clear conception of the objects to be sought, and pursue with single-minded endeavour the things that matter most. It is therefore imperative that the country

should set its face against any scheme for adding to the military and naval burdens, which must be borne, an entirely unnecessary burden for so-called 'National Service.' No one questions either the honesty or the loyalty of Lord Roberts, or the patriotic enthusiasm of those who follow his leadership. But it is necessary to enter a new protest against arguments which are visibly confusing the public appreciation of the true principles of national defence, and which, if they could be carried into effect, would produce results little short of calamitous. In April last year the EDINBURGH REVIEW dealt at length with the scheme of the National Service League, and little more need here be added. Whatever else the scheme would give us, it would not give us the Army of our need. It would not give us the seasoned men required for India, Egypt, or any outpost of Empire; it would not give us men sufficiently well-trained to meet the conscript armies of the Continent if ever we should be compelled by future foreign engagements to send an army abroad. The scheme would withdraw from their duties with the Regular Army during five months of the year some 2000 captains and 10,000 non-commissioned officers for the purpose of training compulsory recruits and men coming up for annual refresher courses, and if it is to apply to the whole population, and to produce anything approaching to efficiency, it would cost not less than £20,000,000 a year.

The foundation of this and similar schemes is the denying to the Navy of one of its chief functions—that of forbidding invasion. Notwithstanding our vast fleet of 'Dreadnoughts,' the development of our flotillas, the power and range of our submarines, and the potent auxiliary of the far-seeing and wireless-carrying sea-plane, the 'danger of invasion' has again become the subject of alarmist questions in the House of Commons. The Military Correspondent of the 'Times' is probably the most influential exponent of the doctrines of the National Service League. He is never tired of attacking what he calls 'the fallacies of the Blue Water extremists,' and of preaching the danger of invasion. The object of the 'invasion scare,' which he preaches, is to force the country into consenting to the creation of an Army more or less on the Continental scale. The German bogey and the 'bolt from the 'blue' are conjured up in order to spread panic; the absence or the failure of the fleet is assumed; and those who object

to such extravagant assumptions are denounced as belonging to the 'Black Treachery School.'

Happily this country is yet sound on the naval question; the National Service League and those who think with it have not affected national policy, and no hostile influence has stayed the necessary expansion of the Navy Estimates, which has been continuous since the year 1907-8. But there is evidence of growing hostility to adequate expenditure on the Navy, and many politicians will be the more readily inclined to support this attitude if they are persuaded that the chief duty of the Navy—the defence of these islands—can be better undertaken by a land force. It is significant that quite lately the Military Correspondent of the 'Times' has been urging that national service soldiers are the equivalent of ships at sea, and telling us that vast and growing Estimates for the Navy are 'only the 'natural corollary of our evasion of national service.' *

To do the exponents of these doctrines justice, they do not really believe that four months' training would be enough to fit men for the adventurous policy which is in the minds of some soldiers. They desire to get their principle of compulsion accepted, and then to argue for its extension. Obviously, if the Navy is powerless to avert invasion, it would be madness, not to say crime, to oppose men of four months' training to seasoned Continental soldiers of three years' service. As for all the talk about the absence of the Navy and all the picturesque phrases about the Navy being 'manacled' or 'tied' to our coasts, the answer is that it is the function of a navy, not to wander about the void, but to lie adjacent to a possible enemy, for force attracts force. And if, in spite of the necessary presence of a large British naval force watching the German naval force, an invading army could still be landed, other measures than the farcical device of four months' compulsory service would be imperative. It would be necessary to build up an army at least equal in training, and as nearly as possible equal in numbers, to the Continental armies which might invade us. The difficulties in the way are extremely serious, for even if we trained every young man and made him the equal of a Continental soldier, and if we further surrounded London and all our principal cities with

* Times, January 22, 1914.

impregnable forts, it would avail us nothing, unless we also maintained a sufficient fleet in home waters to secure the free passage of the food and raw material upon which our national existence depends. As Mr. Balfour once said, we should be beaten without firing a shot, enslaved without striking a blow.

The Mediterranean situation presents somewhat different but connected problems. In the first place, what are the obligations implied by the *Entente Cordiale*? One of the most significant sentences in Mr. Churchill's speech on the Navy Estimates is that in which he explained the Admiralty plan of placing in the Mediterranean by the end of 1915 a battle-squadron based on Malta. 'The principal reason for this,' he said, 'was that we should remain the independent guardian 'of our own important and long-established interests in the 'Mediterranean, *and should not incur any exceptional obligations* '*in any directions*.' The words put in italics should be especially noted. Nevertheless, the *Entente* has had the remarkable effect of transferring the French fleet to the Mediterranean and denuding the Channel and the Ocean of French fighting ships. This concentration of the French navy was inaugurated by M. Delcassé, as Minister of Marine, and carried into effect by his successor, M. Baudin. It appears to be a measure of permanent policy, though strongly opposed in many quarters, and notably in a new volume mentioned at the head of this paper, by M. de Lanessan, a deputy, formerly Governor-General of Indo-China, and once Minister of Marine. It is not necessary here to enter fully into the arguments, but the reasons for the concentration, as viewed in the French navy, were set forth by the late Vice-Admiral Germinet in a remarkable press interview, which attracted considerable attention at the time:

'Cette concentration de nos forces dans la Méditerranée, dont il est question depuis longtemps, c'est de la bonne stratégie. Depuis l'entente cordiale, le rôle de la marine française se trouve parfaitement défini. Il consiste à conquérir et à garder la maîtrise de la mer en Méditerranée. Il faut que nos communications entre la côte de Provence et nos côtes algérienne et tunisienne soient assurées d'une façon absolue en toute circonstance. Nous avons en Algérie des forces militaires, comme le 19e corps, que le gouvernement, en cas de mobilisation, aura à faire passer dans la métropole. Nous avons à nous occuper du ravitaillement. Bref, les raisons

fourmillent pour justifier cette mesure. Des esprits chagrins émettent cette opinion : nous allons ainsi faire le jeu de l'Angleterre, et notre rôle sans gloire consistera à garder la route des Indes. Eh bien ! Nous ne faisons pas le jeu de l'Angleterre, nous faisons strictement notre jeu à nous, puisque c'est notre intérêt que nous défendons. *Tant mieux si cette décision a pour conséquence de faire d'une pierre deux coups et de servir les intérêts de la défense anglaise.* Du reste, si l'on envisage l'éventualité d'une guerre entre l'Allemagne et l'Angleterre ou entre les puissances de la Triplice et de la Triple-Entente, une situation analogue se produira dans le Nord. Les rôles seront renversés en ce sens que l'Angleterre, *en sauvegardant ses côtes contre les forces navales allemandes, assurera par cela même la sécurité de nos ports de l'ouest et du nord.* C'est là le jeu de toute alliance ! '*

But French soldiers are not altogether satisfied with such a distribution of burdens, even supposing the suggested arrangement to be an accomplished fact. They would like to see the British Expeditionary Force, expanded by men compulsorily trained, and ready to be employed on French or Belgian soil, for the protection of their left flank, in the Valley of the Sambre or along the line of the Meuse. They gather some confidence in this matter, because prominent British soldiers have been over to France taking a very practical interest in the manœuvres and exercises of the troops, and doubtless on occasions familiarising themselves with the topography of the countries. Here we see the relation of the Mediterranean naval situation to the British Army and to compulsory service. If the French guard, or help to guard, the pathway of the Mediterranean, should we not place our Expeditionary Force at their disposal for continental operations? Lord Roberts's plan, set forth in 'Facts and Fallacies,' is to have a permanently mobilised long-service army distributed between India, England, and the Colonial stations, and a short-service force, which, with the available portion of the long-service army, would give us 'a 'mobilisation strength equal to our estimated requirement of '300,000 men immediately available for over-sea purposes in 'any great war,' and behind it 1,000,000 trained men 'both for 'home defences and for voluntary expansion in a great struggle 'over-sea.' †

That soldiers who have been studying continental wars

* Echo de Paris, September 13, 1912.
† Facts and Fallacies, p. 162.

half their lives, should be willing and even eager to enter upon continental adventures is intelligible enough. But from all such entanglements we must hold aloof, because to be drawn into the ambit of continental militarism would be to court utter disaster in the field, and to sacrifice our unique advantage as an insular and a seafaring people. The history of maritime nations cries aloud against the disastrous entanglements of the shore. It was not the defeat of the Armada in 1588 that rang the knell for the naval downfall of Spain, but her long land campaigns, which were the open wound of the State. No battle on the seas finally determined the naval decay of the Netherlands; that decay was due to the heavy drain upon her resources caused by the unequal struggle on shore. Again, in our own great struggle with France, the French weakened and failed, not from incompetence or lack of courage, but because of the vast resources in men and money that were continually being consumed in continental war.

The naval situation in the Mediterranean is in itself sufficiently grave and difficult to warn us against directing attention to anything but the sea. That situation is, or may be, affected in two ways by the French concentration. If, on the one hand, we gain something by the presence of a large French fleet in the Mediterranean, on the other we find the strength of that fleet powerfully stimulating the naval activities of Italy and Austria-Hungary. Italy had, indeed, already been aroused to greater naval efforts by her struggle with Turkey, and by the consciousness that her successful enterprise in Libia was being watched enviously by Austria-Hungary. The two countries, though allies, do not love each other. The spirit of '*Italia Irredenta!*' is not dead in Italy, and awakes responsive chords in the maritime region of Trieste. There is too the ever-present fear that Austria might over-run Venetia and attempt to regain her grasp upon Lombardy. Reciprocally, Italy might throttle the commerce of Austria-Hungary at its egress from the Adriatic. Both countries have talked of the command of the Adriatic; the Austrians consider it vital to themselves, and there are agitators like Herr Max Schloss, who, in a pamphlet recently published in Vienna, 'Der Jammer unserer Seemacht,' says that they must, sooner or later, come to blows, for Albania is a 'still-born 'State,' and Valona must fall to the Dual Monarchy. Mean-

while Italy widens her ambitions and aspires to the command of the Eastern basin of the Mediterranean. But the advent of the French fleet, and the avowed intention of strengthening it, is altering the situation. Suspicion between Italy and Austria-Hungary tends to diminish in proportion as the power of the French grows. It may be difficult to conceive of two countries, which have found such bitter dregs of recollection in the cup of amity they have drunk together, fighting as allies. Nevertheless, so long as the grouping of Powers is as we know it, we cannot keep the possibility of the united action of the allies out of our calculations, and consequently the Mediterranean Sea is now assuming as large a place as the North Sea in the estimates of our naval requirements.

We are not in the Mediterranean without reason or through any accident. That sea is the most important link of the Empire on the longest and most important commercial route in the world. The tenacity with which we have held Gibraltar; our temporary possession of Minorca; our strong position at Malta—the 'watch-tower of Egypt,' wrote Whitworth, 'the most important out-work of India,' said Nelson; our administrative control of Cyprus; our occupation of Egypt; and our large interests in the Suez Canal, with Perim, Aden, and other outposts beyond—all these are marks of the supreme significance which attaches to the Mediterranean route. Even in times when these islands could feed their own people, and when the volume of our trade interests was comparatively small, the vital importance of the Mediterranean was manifest. The problem has changed, but it is with us, and it will endure. Since Nelson's time, France has become established in Morocco, Algeria, and Tunis; Italy in Libia; and ourselves in Egypt; while two Mediterranean States, which had no weight in former times, have grown in strength, and, translating ambitions into practical policy, are building fighting fleets. Unless we can exert command in Mediterranean waters, Malta, though it may hold out long, will ultimately fall; Egypt will pass to another Power, and our direct route to India will be blocked. To mention these things is to show that we cannot relinquish our hold upon the Mediterranean or trust to any alliance for maintaining it without inflicting irreparable disaster upon the Empire.

The importance of the Mediterranean to us as a principal

avenue for the supply of the first necessities of our people, is hardly less conspicuous. The Royal Commission on the Supply of Food and Raw Material in Time of War, 1903, showed that our imports of wheat and flour brought by the Mediterranean route had rapidly increased, and in 1904 approached one-half of our total importation. It was further estimated that wheat and flour would absorb 12½ per cent. of the shipping employed on the Mediterranean route. In addition, large quantities of other food-stuffs come by the same route, as well as wool, cotton, hides, oil, rubber, and other necessaries and raw materials in increasing volume. In return we send back to the countries bordering the Mediterranean the products of our factories, the two operations being economically reciprocal and inseparable. Serious attack upon this Mediterranean trade would inflict irreparable injury upon British industries.

The defence of our interests in the Mediterranean, as elsewhere, must in the last event depend upon fighting ships. There would undoubtedly be losses to the floating trade on the outbreak of war, and some vessels might prefer to take the longer route by the Cape, but the Royal Commission was of opinion, in view of the geographical position of the maritime countries, that British ships in the Mediterranean would scarcely be in any serious danger, 'except in the case of war 'with France, when they would be threatened with attack 'from the French torpedo-boat stations on the North African 'coast.' We are now understood to have purchased the neutrality, if not the active co-operation, of France, but, since the deliberations of the Royal Commission, other maritime Powers have assumed the place of the French. The number, power, and range of Italian and Austro-Hungarian flotillas of destroyers and submarines have greatly increased, and the air service has come to enable an enemy to discover and observe the objects of his attack. Obviously the strategy of commerce defence, in the Mediterranean as elsewhere, must be left to the Admiralty, but Sir Cyprian Bridge believes that in practice it will necessarily be based on the convoy method, or the cruising method, or a combination of the two.*

It may be well, at this point, in order to illustrate the

* The Art of Naval Warfare, p. 145.

Mediterranean situation, to set forth concisely the exact situation of the navies of Italy and Austria-Hungary. Italy possesses eight pre-Dreadnought battleships, but two of them have little value, and will soon disappear. Two others are lightly protected, and the four ships of the 'Roma' class do not together carry as many 12-inch guns as does the first Italian 'Dreadnought.' Presently 'Dreadnoughts,' or their successors, alone will count, and of them Italy has four completed, to which two others will be added next year—the 'Andrea Doria' and 'Caio Duilio.' We thus count six Italian 'Dreadnoughts,' and look for the completion of four more, but not until 1917 at the earliest, or more probably 1918, and in the case of one or more of them, 1919. Italy has also four large armoured cruisers, each mounting four 10-inch guns, three others rather smaller, and two which possess little value. Several small swift cruisers, with mining equipment, are completing. More important is the great development of the flotillas, to which additions are continually being made. There are forty destroyers on the list, of which thirty-three are completed, and those coming forward are big 30 and 32-knot boats, some of them rising to 1000 tons. The modern torpedo boats number seventy-one, of which sixty-three are completed, and there are twenty submarines of various classes.

Austria-Hungary has four 'Dreadnoughts' completed and in hand, one of them being much delayed. It was stated in many quarters, without authority, that four others were in hand; but this is not the case, for no money provision has been made, nor can be until the latter part of the present year at the earliest, so that probably none of them can be ready until 1918. Of fighting quality are the three pre-Dreadnought Radetzkys, which are approximately the equals of the British Lord Nelsons; and there are three other ships which have a certain value, though their biggest guns are only 9·4's. A new armoured cruiser has been built, making two in all, and there are seven protected cruisers. The destroyers number nineteen, and there are about fifty torpedo boats, of which some thirty have been completed. Of submarines there are six, and eight others are in hand or provided for.

From these few facts it will be seen that the two Powers have respectable forces, but that we must chiefly take account

of the ten 'Dreadnoughts'—six for Italy and four for Austria-Hungary—which will be in commission probably by the close of the present year, or early next year, and also of the growing strength of the flotillas. Sixty-five destroyers, about a hundred torpedo boats, and thirty-four submarines will constitute a menace which is bound to affect the Mediterranean situation materially, and these craft will infallibly go on increasing both in number and power.

It is in view of this formidable situation that the Admiralty have shaped, and perhaps varied, their policy, and that Mr. Churchill has taken certain steps which have been the subject of much question and discussion. In his Memorandum on Naval Defence Requirements, prepared by the Admiralty for the Government of Canada, October 25, 1912, after the passing of the 1912 Amendment to the German Navy Law, the First Lord, after explaining the great development of the German navy, and the increases of Italy and Austria-Hungary, with their effect in bringing about a concentration of the British Fleet in Home waters, referred briefly to the new situation arising in the Mediterranean. Mr. Borden, in his famous speech in the Dominion House of Commons on the 5th of December, in the same year, directed attention to the withdrawal of the British Mediterranean Fleet to Gibraltar, in order that it might be more easily available for necessary aid in Home waters. This was the idea, now abandoned, of the 'pivot fleet,' which was to have been based on Gibraltar, so that it might strike east and west at need, but which obviously could not strike both east and west at the same time. Much was also said at the same period about the 'whole-world requirements of the Empire'—which do not necessarily involve the presence of British battleships in distant oceans. Again, in his recent speech on the Navy Estimates, the First Lord referred rather vaguely to the policy of an 'Imperial Squadron,' and to the required development of naval establishments, possessing docks, defences, and repairing plant, in Canada, Australia, and South Africa, with defence flotillas, ready to operate 'in con-' junction with the Imperial Squadron when it arrives.' The lack of precision, reality, and direct relation to practical politics which underlies these remarks is shown by the First Lord's statement, in the same speech, that the safety of Australia and New Zealand was secured by British sea-power and by the

alliance with Japan. 'No European State'—he said—'would 'or could invade or conquer New Zealand or Australia unless 'the British Navy had been destroyed.' He added that 'the same naval power of Great Britain in European waters 'also protected New Zealand and Australia.' The latter remark refers, of course, to an axiom of naval strategy—that danger can be controlled, like an electric current, at the source —and it plainly applies equally well to the naval defence of Canada.

On an examination of the whole of the facts the conclusion is inevitable, and Mr. Churchill has not concealed it, that the Canadian ships were, in effect, intended for service in the Mediterranean, or at any rate as a western squadron based on Gibraltar. In regard to the base, it must be confessed that a certain unsettlement of ideas has been at work, and that sometimes Gibraltar and sometimes Malta has been regarded as the necessary base. The Admiralty has now decided to place in the Mediterranean, based on Malta, a battle-squadron which by the end of next year is to consist of eight battleships, of which six, apparently, may be Dreadnoughts, with four large armoured cruisers, four light cruisers, and sixteen destroyers of the Beagle type. With this arrangement no fault can be found, except that in the flotillas there will be a great inferiority, notwithstanding the excellence of the Beagle class, to the flotillas of possible adversaries. This reconstitution of the Mediterranean Fleet was originally planned on the anticipation that Canada would contribute three ships. It was necessary either that the Canadian ships should be laid down in June 1913, or that three of our own ships should be hastened by beginning them earlier. When the Canadian Naval Aid Bill proved abortive, the latter course was adopted 'as a temporary expedient'; and now again, when the Canadian Government finds itself unable to reintroduce the Bill, there is to be acceleration of two ships of the 1914–15 programme, the benefit of which, however, cannot extend beyond the beginning of the year 1917.

The conviction cannot be escaped that this resort to temporary expedients in such a grave concern only puts off the evil day, and leaves us resting upon a margin narrow and insecure. The extreme importance which Mr. Churchill attached to the Canadian ships, his declaration that, whatever happened, there would be 'no whining here,' his warning to British taxpayers

that they must assume the burden, and his declaration—vague, certainly, in view of the Mediterranean question—that whatever might be the decision of Canada, Great Britain would not 'in 'any circumstances fail in her duty to the Overseas Dominions 'of the Crown,' contrast alarmingly with his rather casual treatment of the subject in his speech on the Navy Estimates.

He had declared, in the House of Commons, March 26, 1913, that 'any ships which we might have to build in consequence 'of new developments in the Mediterranean' would be additional to the six years' programme, 1912–13 to 1917–18. The revision of that programme, in consequence of the 1912 amendment to the German Navy Law, was announced in the House of Commons in July 1912, and given effect to in March 1913, making a total of four big ships in 1912–13, five in 1913–14, and four in each of the subsequent four years, the New Zealand and Malaya being additional to the establishment. In his recent speech in the House of Commons, the First Lord said that his friends were justified in asking what had made the Canadian ships necessary, and additional to his programme, but he did not answer the question. He referred instead to the Canadian Memorandum of 1912, which Memorandum, like the amended programme given above, had been prepared with full knowledge of the latest addition to the German Navy Law. The truth is that in July 1912 the Admiralty, as stated above, had considered the possibility of placing a new fleet in the Mediterranean, and that when the decision was arrived at, the addition of three ships, Canadian or other, was assumed. A clear necessity had arisen, and yet Mr. Churchill now takes no steps to lay down any additional ships, though he has himself so plainly declared the need for them.

There seems to be no prospect of the reintroduction of the Canadian Naval Aid Bill in the existing situation in the Senate, and there can be little doubt that the deferred liability of 1912–13 and 1914–15 will have to be liquidated very early in the next financial year. And yet, in his speech on the Estimates the First Lord predicted—'in the absence of any new departure in 'policy'—that the Estimates of 1915–16 will be 'substantially 'lower' than those of the present year. On the other hand, the Chancellor of the Exchequer said only last August that he could not see 'in any direction the slightest prospect of reduc-'tion' of expenditure, and he added, with regard to stopping

the outlay, that it ' would be much too careless a thing to do, ' because once you stop it to the point of danger, disaster will be inevitable.'

It is not the object of this article to enter into a bewildering maze of financial considerations concerning ordinary and extraordinary expenditure, liabilities inherited, current or deferred, or like matters, nor to engage in the battle of the standards and explore the mysteries of percentages in ' Dread- ' nought ' superiority, with their qualifications, and ships additional to percentages ; nor to estimate the probability or otherwise of this ship or that being completed in one quarter of a year or another. Such calculations possess a character of unreality, because often they compare likes with unlikes, and estimates are apt to be defeated by labour troubles and building acceleration, as well as by other circumstances. Mr. Churchill said truly in his speech on the Estimates, that ' programmes ' supersede standards, and actual figures are better than ' percentages.'

But the conclusion of the whole inquiry is definite and beyond question or cavil. The possession of unassailable superiority at sea is a matter of life and death to this country and to the British Empire. As Mr. Lloyd George once said, we do not argue about it ; we go on maintaining it, whatever it may cost. This we must do consistently and steadily.

The time is one of great change in the naval service. Never has development proceeded so rapidly, and we are on the eve of greater changes still. We must, above all things, cease to estimate naval strength merely in the possession of ' Dreadnoughts,' apart from trained complements of officers and men, and fighting and other auxiliaries. The Navy must be complete in every element, material and personal.

Looking into the future, it is already possible to see that many of our present ideas will have to be recast. In the first place warning must be given against counting all so-called ' Dreadnoughts ' as the equals of one another. It is plainly absurd to rank the original ' Dreadnought,' with a total weight of discharge from her main guns of 8500 lb., with the ' Royal ' Sovereign ' class, whose broadside weight is 16,530 lb., or the German ' Nassau ' (6750 lb. from her main guns) with the ' König ' (9810 lb.). But who shall say that the ' Dreadnought ' or super- ' Dreadnought ' is the final element of strength in fighting fleets ?

The present First Lord has more than once referred to the confidence of our submarine officers in the effective power of their craft. Last year he said that if we were confronted with new foreign 'Dreadnoughts' in the Mediterranean, it did not follow that we should build 'Dreadnoughts' in reply. The money might be better disposed in another way. In his speech on the Estimates he suggested a doubt as to whether the war between big ships, their power of hitting one another, was not approaching its culminating phase. He declined to say to the building of how many submarines the sum of £1,150,000 is to be devoted, because that might give some clue to the design. Recently we have been told on high authority that five minutes may see the end of the next naval battle, and that the result may be determined by the first discharge. The Admiralty are increasingly convinced of the power of the submarine, and the First Lord gave assurance that the whole system of naval architecture and the methods of computing naval strength are brought under review by the ever-growing power, range, and seaworthiness of the submarine, and by the increasing range and accuracy of the torpedo. Many factors enter into these speculations. Submarines are growing in cost even more rapidly in proportion than big ships, but it is still possible to build many submarines for the cost of one modern battleship. The mean cost of the 'Iron Dukes' of 1911 was £1,891,572, and of the 'Queen Elizabeths' of 1913 £2,336,075 apiece. The 'life' of submarines, however, is shorter. The growing power of the submarine is seen by the manner in which it is superseding the destroyer. Our programme of destroyer construction has been reduced from twenty in each year to twelve, and possibly the process will continue until the destroyer has disappeared. Its disappearance will be accelerated by the development of a new class of super-destroyers, which are indistinguishable from small cruisers.

The existence of submarines has given the *coup de grâce* to any form of close blockade. Battleships will never again lie off an enemy's port as the ships of Jervis, Nelson, and Cornwallis lay off Brest and Toulon. They can be attacked as they return to their own harbours, and unless they lie in enclosed and well-protected harbours, they will probably be in danger at any time. It is true that, with oil as a fuel,

periodical returns to port may be unnecessary, since oil can be pumped into the ship on the open sea, but the airship and aeroplane have come to discover the whereabouts of squadrons, and a squadron discovered, even with 'sea room' all around it, would be in a situation of great peril. We have spoken of the Mediterranean and its defence, but, in the future, who will say that battleships can live in its waters? These considerations suggest that we are reaching a new turning-point in naval construction. What will be the exact outcome, no one can say. Therefore, though we must still demand the building of 'Dreadnoughts,' because they are, for the present, the most powerful weapons of naval warfare, we need not assume that they will necessarily in the future be the principal instruments for maintaining superiority at sea.

Any fundamental changes must be made with the utmost caution. When Admiral Sir Reginald Custance recently suggested, as a means of reducing the cost of capital ships, that they might carry less armour, which is a very costly feature, he was careful to say that the Admiralty which first entered upon that course would need to be very bold. It may be assumed, therefore, that the Admiralty will proceed slowly in giving practical recognition to the reduced importance of the battleship and the increased importance of the submarine. They will remember how Admiral Aube, when French Minister of Marine, many years ago, listened to the pleadings of what was known as the Jeune École, building submarines of the early type, flimsy torpedo-boats, and small, swift cruisers for commerce destruction, and thus all unwittingly condemned the French navy to decline; for his frail craft rapidly disappeared, few big ships were built, and the result was a fleet which another French Admiral described as a 'fleet of samples.'

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF KINGSHIP

1. **Magna Carta.** By W. S. McKechnie. Glasgow: Maclehose. 1914.
2. **The Great Jurists of the World.** Edited by Sir John Macdonell and Edward Manson. Murray. 1913.
3. **The Ancient Roman Empire and the British Empire in India: The Diffusion of Roman and English Law throughout the World.** Two historical studies. By Viscount Bryce. Oxford: University Press. 1913.
4. **How France is Governed.** By President Poincaré. T. Fisher Unwin. 1913.
5. **The Government of England.** By A. Lawrence Lowell. 1908.
6. **De Monarchia of Dante.** Translated by Philip Wicksteed. Dent. 1897.
7. **De Republica Anglorum.** By Sir Thomas Smith. 1630.

IF intellectual equality could be yoked with political equality there would, perhaps, be no need to possess a constitution so adjusted as to counterbalance the strivings of ambitious or corrupt natures; but since anything more than the political equality of men is inconceivable, it is necessary to possess a governmental machine that almost automatically rejects the tyranny of any single mind or group of minds. Yet, at the same time, the ruling power of a nation, as Dante points out in his 'De Monarchia,' must be a unity. The ruling power, in its impact with affairs, must be a single force. We have then to find a unity that shall represent the resultant force of the nation at any moment, that shall be dominant and yet shall avoid any touch of tyranny. No division of powers must appear; no breach of continuity in guidance must arise. The mind of the nation must be represented with only such changes as arise from changes of thought, not changes of personality, nor multiplication of guides. In that remarkable work, Dante's 'De Monarchia,' there is a passage that cannot be too often quoted. It is thus rendered in Dr. Philip Wicksteed's fine translation:

'Right governments, so conceived, contemplate freedom, to wit that men should exist for their own sakes. For the citizens

are not there for the sake of the consuls, nor the nation for the sake of the king, but conversely, the consuls for the sake of the citizens, the king for the sake of the nation. For just as the conduct of the State is not established for the benefit of the laws, but the laws for the benefit of the conduct of the State, so too they who live under the law are not ordained for the benefit of the legislator, but rather he for theirs, as saith the Philosopher again in what has been left by him on the present matter. Hence it is clear that, albeit the consul or king may be master of others with respect to the way, yet with respect to the end they are the servants of others; and the monarch most of all, for he must assuredly be regarded as the servant of all. Hence it may begin to appear at this point how the monarch is conditioned by the end set before him in laying down the laws.'

To Dante, writing certainly with prophetic mind in the midst of the chaos of his time, the 'conditioned' or constitutional monarch gives to the human race its best disposition and is necessary for the well-being of the world. But he realised fully that the ideal monarchy of which he dreamed, hedged round at every point with laws and duties, could not be created at the wave of a legislator's wand. The king or emperor is the representative of the people, elected of the people, and yet not adequately elected unless the electors are so moved with the sense of profound responsibility as to be 'reckoned the heralds of divine providence.' In a word, to this great jurist and poet, kingship in its ideal form is essential to the ideal people: a head which is the mind and servant of the body politic, an immovable, unchangeable, central element wherein are concentrated the thoughts, the fears, the aspirations, the perpetual striving of a great and indomitable people.

Such a conception in such an age, when Dante, looking forth from the flotsam and jetsam of the Western Empire, saw far away in the past the great Roman Empire that he idealised, and in the deep future the far greater empire of all mankind that he visualised, such a conception, unrealisable though it be, did foreshadow possibilities of constitutional evolution that England alone as yet has found it possible to translate, in some not altogether negligible fashion, into action. Lord Bryce, in his remarkable essays on the Roman and British Empires, brings out the fact that the British Empire alone of all the States that the world has seen is at all comparable with the Roman Empire. He finds in the

two systems of Roman and English law—which between them cover 'nearly the whole of the civilised and most of 'the uncivilised world'—possibilities of fusion between the juristic work of the two empires, and declares that 'on the 'whole the progress of the world is towards uniformity in 'law, and towards a more evident uniformity than is discover- 'able either in the sphere of religious beliefs or in that of 'political institutions.' It is remarkable that an essentially modern thinker like Lord Bryce should look into the far future for a human political unity not dissimilar to that for which Dante Alighieri yearned.

England's experience is of unique importance in the history of human institutions. Her experience covers a vast period of time and almost every possible phase of human passion and weakness, human nobility and self-sacrifice, not on the part of men only, but of women also; not on the part of one class only, but of all classes; not on the part of one race only, but of almost every type of humanity that has achieved distinction on the wide plains of Europe. Slowly through centuries England has gathered into her living self races, institutions, customs, laws. Slowly, by an ordeal as of fire and endless strain on the anvil of experience, she welded out of the profuse material supplied by all ages and all climes her Common Law and her political constitution. Each has served, and served well, in times of agony and stress, and not less well in even more dangerous times of ease and vast prosperity, a people that has been unconsciously great and has given its sons with splendid lavishness to the enlargement of the frontiers of civilisation.

Not only has England's Common Law halved the world with the law of Rome, but her political institutions have won the whole world for themselves, though with varying measures of success and with not always happy degrees of modification. When to-day we look out upon the republics and monarchies of the world, we see often enough that the 'higher intellect' of reasoning—to use Dante's phrase—has somewhat too readily separated itself from the 'lower intellect' of experience, and that the parliamentary government, the central executive, and the form of kingship that England long ago developed out of her experience have become in other lands something far removed from the results that history has

slowly worked out for us here in our little isle. This is not the place in which to trace the history of constitutions, or to consider, as we might well do with alarm, the reaction on our own political life of certain foreign forms of government originally planned by the light of pure reason upon our results, but not built upon a basis of personal experience. Yet we may say this, that in so far as these foreign constitutions have fallen away from the ideal of kingship—and it has been recklessly abandoned or foolishly excluded from the constitutional scheme in various modern monarchies as well as in most modern republics—to that extent they have lessened the efficiency of the State. Whenever a king or emperor or president has taken into his unguided hands the executive, has exercised undelegated power over the representatives of the people, has attempted to show forth in his actions his own mind rather than the mind of the people, he has forgotten the experiences of England and has missed the lessons that her ordeals might have taught him.

It is, of course, in a measure true, as Sir Courtenay Ilbert declares in his essay on Montesquieu in 'The Great Jurists of the World,' that :

> 'There is no one best form of State or constitution : no law is good or bad in the abstract. Every law, civil and political, must be considered in its relation to the environment, and by the adaptation to that environment its excellence must be judged. If you wish to know and understand the spirit of a law, its essence, its true and inner meaning, that on which its vitality and efficiency depend, you must examine it in its relations to all its antecedents and to all its surroundings.'

This theory explains many of the modifications that the system of representative and constitutional government has undergone in many lands in two hemispheres ; but it does not touch the fundamental principle of representation by which an ideal political system concentrates itself into one resultant point where kingship dwells.

Dante's conception of kingship is equally satisfied at first sight either by the hereditary kingship that is rooted in the English constitution, or by the kingship that is represented by a President in other constitutions. To judge between these two forms of kingship it is well to turn from the 'higher intellect' of pure reason to the 'lower intellect' of experience.

The drawbacks that pure reason suggests to an hereditary kingship are almost too obvious to need discussion. The king may be a bad man or he may be a weak man. England has had kings who were bad and kings who were weak; and it was in the struggle with these kings that the constitution was slowly evolved. Again, the king may be not only a strong and widely informed man, as he should be, but a personally ambitious man, as he should not be. In our early history, as Dr. McKechnie points out in his valuable work on 'Magna Carta,' such kings served their generation by centralising power and thus giving efficiency and life to our law; but men of this type have not sat upon the English throne for many generations. The English throne offers, to speak frankly, no scope for personal ambition other than the ambition to reign over a happy and contented people. Against weakness or badness or personal ambition on the part of the sovereign seven centuries of constitutional development in all kinds of political weather have at last adequately guarded the English people. The danger from personal ambition has come, and may yet come, rather from ministers of the Crown than from the Crown itself; it exhibits itself in the ambition to play the part of Mayor of the Palace by tickling with uneconomic promises and fantastic fairy tales the ears of the electorate.

On the other hand, the presidential system of kingship offers unlimited scope to personal ambition. The vacant chair is necessarily the goal of ambitious men, who seldom are overscrupulous, and who often, if opportunity serves, will be ready enough to imitate the part that Napoleon Bonaparte played with supreme, and Louis Napoleon with indifferent, success. A presidential chair vacant at brief intervals is an endless temptation to the demagogue or the ambitious politician, and tends to create in all political parties a shallow class to whom politics is either a trade or a game. Even when the sound sense of the people, as in the United States, checks in some measure this tendency, nevertheless the electors remain in a state of unrest from election to election. Political instability is bad for any nation, and inevitably leads to political corruption and to the weakening of the moral sinews of the entire community. Even at the best we find, as in that most august of presidencies the Papacy, that to avoid the election of one or other of ambitious and often dangerous

candidates, a weak though a good man is placed in the chair. In fact there is no certainty that in the case of a presidency the chosen man will be more suitable for the position of representing the resultant mind of the people than in the case of an hereditary monarchy safeguarded as it is in England; while, on the other hand, the risk is always run that a weak man, or a bad man, or a man of immoderate personal ambition may succeed in achieving the object of his ambition or in becoming the deliberate choice of men more dangerous than himself. It is a noticeable fact that in nearly a century and a half the United States, though out of its ever-growing population it apparently possessed and possesses an enormous range of choice, has rarely secured a President of the first political rank. The nation has wisely been content to try to secure unambitious capable men of blameless record.

As against these drawbacks the presidential system has this advantage, that it can be claimed on the part of a president that he is directly elected. Napoleon Bonaparte was elected First Consul of France by more than 3,000,000 voters, while only some 1500 voted against his election. It gives a sense of power to each individual voter to help to make a king. More than 3,500,000 voters voted the First Consul into the hereditary Imperial throne. He was the direct choice of the people, and there is undoubtedly a pleasure in the active choice of a president that cannot be experienced in an hereditary monarchy. But this pleasure has to be paid for. There is no need to dwell on the cost of the choice of the great Napoleon. We are a little apt to forget, perhaps, that he crowned himself. But the cost of the election of an ordinary president in an ordinary country is great. In the United States, for instance, the actual money cost, both for campaign funds and on account of trade dislocation, is enormous. These periodic orgies of expenditure for the pleasure of directly choosing a president far exceed the aggregate expenditure incurred over the same period of time for maintaining the dignity of an hereditary throne.

The power of changing the president is hardly an advantage, since the need for change condemns the system. The constitution must be ineffective indeed if it can only achieve its single purpose by more or less arbitrary substitutions of one personality for another as the representative of the mind

or personality of the people. It means that the scheme of government is incapable of supplying continuous kingship. But in no other respect than that of personal choice is a president more attractive than a king, for in all the other elements of kingship the hereditary king, under adequate constitutional checks, possesses all the qualities that the most exigent elector would demand of a king for life or a king for a term of years. Doubtless the very factors which are here called drawbacks—the temptation to ambition, the opportunity for the demagogue, the unsettling of political life—are to a certain restless section of the community positive advantages. The fisherman loves troubled waters. But it cannot be seriously argued that the broad general interests of the nation shall be sacrificed in order to give larger scope for personal or factional intrigue.

Incidentally it is worth while to note that the question of hereditary kingship stands totally apart from the question of an hereditary legislative chamber. The latter institution has been very widely, and, from many points of view, very wisely condemned. Yet it is possible to carry out the attack on an hereditary legislative chamber in a dangerous way. In the course of logic few constitutional principles shall see salvation. The principle of government by majorities has only to be stated to be revealed in all its logical absurdity. It assumes that all men are intellectually and morally equal; that any group of 1001 men ought always to be the masters of any group of 1000. Simultaneously it assumes that the majority will be absolutely just and will represent the best interests of the minority. These assumptions are palpably untrue. Government by majorities is in theory absurd. That acute logician and dialectician, M. Poincaré, in his recent book on the Republic that he rules, does not attempt to defend the principle of majorities. It is at least as indefensible as the principle of heredity. Indeed, according to the theory of the new eugenists—whatever that may be worth—the principle of heredity is admirable and should enable us to produce legislators of any required degree of intelligence.

More valuable than eugenic theory is the accepted fact of *noblesse oblige*. This it is that has caused the hereditary principle in a second chamber to work far better than its critics realise. The record of the House of Lords in past

centuries is no mean one, and on more than one occasion has proved that House to be at least as patriotic and far-sighted as the House of Commons. But indeed both Houses from time to time have been guilty of the grossest errors of judgment and policy. Nevertheless the principle of government by majorities is unquestionably to be preferred to that of government by hereditary legislators in so far as the two principles come into conflict. It is to be preferred even when it reduces itself to an apparent absurdity, as for instance when the contending parties are so evenly balanced that the vote of a discharged lunatic turns the scale. For, in spite of this and other logical absurdities, the principle on the whole works well, especially in England. It is a useful convention; for while it does little harm to those who are or imagine themselves to be intellectually above the average, it gives a sense of self-satisfaction to the great multitude that is only just up to or below the average. The principle of representation by majorities creates an atmosphere of equity that is of the highest value in the realm of government. The hereditary principle, as applied to legislation, is resented by the people and creates a sense of unfairness and an atmosphere of revolt that is of the greatest danger. Moreover, in matters of taxation the principle of representation secures practical checks that would be impossible under any other system. But on the whole it is wiser not to employ in testing political institutions the 'higher intellect' of pure reason, but rather the 'lower intellect' of experience, which in practice gives us approximate solutions of theoretically insoluble problems.

In the same way the principle of kingship must not be judged on *a priori* assumptions, but tested by experience. And the experience of England shows how the elective and the hereditary principles can be reconciled in practice. The sovereign of England is sovereign by virtue of a statutory title. The crown passes 'at the moment of the ancestor's death' to the nearest Protestant heir of the body of the Electress Sophia, the grand-daughter of King James I., who has handed down to our time the succession of Saxon, Norman, Angevin, Plantagenet, Tudor and Stuart kings. There is no breach of continuity in English kingship. The king never dies. But the people have determined the line of kingship. In excluding the descendants of King James II. by the Act of Settlement of

1702, the nation, says Dr. Rudolph Gneist in his history of the English Constitution, 'emancipated itself from the male line of 'a dynasty which had utterly misunderstood and neglected 'every duty of the Crown and every task imposed by the 'times.' But the nation secured the continuity of kingship and the sense of unbroken national life when it settled the throne once more in another strand of the immemorial line.

At the same time the nation secured what it believed to be an essential of national health; it associated kingship for ever in England with the principles of the Reformation. There are only two things that can in law unseat an English king: death and communion with the Church of Rome. Apparently, as the late Professor Maitland pointed out, the king could without danger to his throne renounce the Church of England and become a Wesleyan Methodist. King George III. was in fact in the closest sympathy with the Nonconformist Churches, and that sympathy certainly inspired the hearts of some of his descendants. Apart from this provision for the official faith of the sovereign, the settlement of the Crown has in other ways had no elaborate consideration. The possibilities of infancy, of lunacy, of abdication are left to be dealt with as they arise. In only one instance in the long centuries of English kingship—that of King George III.—has the question of mental deficiency arisen.

It is important to realise for how vast a length of time the ancestors of our present King were subject to the preservative forces of constitutional law. In the thirteenth century, after the great Norman Kings had finally consolidated the land and stamped it with national characteristics, we find Bracton stating (to use Professor Maitland's words) 'The king is below 'no man, but he is below God and the law; law makes the 'king; the king is bound to obey the law, though, if he breaks 'it, his punishment must be left to God.' The thirteenth century did not distinguish between legal and moral and religious duties, and the moral pressure of that age had as much weight as legal pressure in this. The cases of Edward II. and Richard II. show that the idea of divine hereditary right had already passed away save in Dante's sense. From Henry III.'s time constitutional law and the common law swiftly grew side by side. When we reach the Tudor age we see, despite the vast personal power of the sovereign, due

largely to the dominant nature of the Tudor family, that the king was bound on all sides by law and that his servants were already responsible for his acts: 'His command would 'shield no one who had broken the law.' To-day the King necessarily relies on his ministers for the time being, though in fact the sovereign has always in recent times brought to bear on problems arising out of the Royal prerogative a wealth of knowledge that has proved of immense help to the advisers of the Crown. Certainly neither Queen Victoria nor King Edward VII. was, nor is His Majesty King George V., a mere recorder of decisions arrived at by those advisers. The advisers have often been the advised, and there can be little doubt that either environment or heredity or both have given to the members of the reigning House a singular knowledge of men and of affairs, and a peculiar gift of consulting with and advising the leaders of both political parties in turn without adopting party views or political shibboleths. The Crown has nothing to do with party save in so far as party views help to make up that representative capacity which is the chief glory of the Crown. An acute American scholar and observer, Mr. A. Lawrence Lowell, the Professor of the Science of Government in Harvard University, in his remarkable volume on 'The Government of England,' tells us that 'accord-'ing to the earlier theory of the Constitution the ministers 'were the counsellors of the king. It was for them to advise 'and for him to decide. Now the parts are almost reversed. 'The king is consulted, but the ministers decide.' The king does not enter into party strife. The views of his cabinet are laid before him and before Parliament 'as if they were 'the views of one man,' Mr. Gladstone declared that 'there 'is not a doubt that the aggregate of direct influence normally 'exercised by the sovereign upon the counsels and proceedings 'of his ministers is considerable in amount, tends to perman-'ence and solidity of action, and confers much benefit upon 'the country.'

This 'solidity of action' is the fact which deserves special stress. Kingship secures continuity of action in national and international affairs. In the latter sphere even more than in the former an hereditary kingship is of profound value to England. The interchange of views of chancelleries is formal; the interchange of views of monarchs is informal,

and it would be difficult to exaggerate the value of having a man at the head of the English State who can create that intangible atmosphere of intimate relations, without in any way pledging the country to any definite line of policy. Not in his official but in his social position as one of the monarchs of Europe, the King of England has opportunities of work for England that no Prime Minister or Foreign Secretary could find. No doubt, if Europe were republican in fact or even in mood, this would not be the case. But since 1848, the year of revolutions, the monarchical principle with constitutional modifications has taken deeper root than ever in European soil; and the great republic of France undoubtedly suffers from her want of a representative who can speak on equal and intimate social terms with the kings of Europe. When Italy deliberately chose a monarchy rather than the republic of which Mazzini dreamed, she took the wiser course. The hereditary head of a constitutional government has opportunities of creating ties of national friendship that no president can secure.

Loyalty to the principle of kingship is a strange and wonderful thing; it has survived the advent of bad and detestable kings; it has ripened into richer manifestations in the presence of queens, such as Queen Elizabeth and Queen Victoria; it has added romance, heroism, and self-abnegation to the relationship of State and subject. It is not alleged that in the case of great republics such as France and the United States there is not a high degree of national loyalty. Loyalty and national pride are deep-rooted in the peoples of these great lands. But it would be idle to pretend that personal loyalty to a president and to various legislative and administrative bodies can ever burn with the fire that, be it reasonable or unreasonable, has been associated throughout the records of history with the name of king. It may be unreasonable, and one has only to recall the loyalty to the Pretenders in 1715 and 1745, and, even later, the loyalty of the Nonjurors, to know that loyalty can be unreasonable. But if so, loyalty is only unreasonable in the human sense. Loyalty to a person, loyalty to a family, loyalty to a House is one of the root facts of human history. Nowhere can we get away from it: mock the idea how we will, it still faces us. It existed before Feudalism and it has survived it. Throughout the history of nations

it has been a national force. Not only does it shine out in the myths that lie behind history; not only does it run like a ray of sunlight through Homeric lays and the Sagas of the North; not only does loyalty glide through the mysteries and dreams and wonders of the Middle Ages as if she were their spirit and their theme; but nowhere in the limits of history, whether in the East or in the West, can we read about the deeds and deaths of kings without finding that the fugue moves round one perfect motif—*loyalty that never fails*.

The incense of loyalty haunts the cathedrals of time. In the East it is a religious cult as well as a quality of the heart. The obedience, and what is more important, the welfare, of our vast Indian Empire is intimately associated with kingship and with the religious cult of loyalty to the person of the King. No such obedience, no such love, could be yielded to any other form of government. During the visit of the King and Queen to India—a visit that showed to the people of India their King as a real person, and proved to the Empire the value of his influence and the catholicity of his interests—an incident occurred that revealed the intensity of Indian feeling. After the Sovereigns had come down from their thrones at the close of the Coronation Durbar, and all the Kings, Princes, and Captains had passed with them away from the scene of the Great Obedience, and the two vacant thrones alone faced the populace, suddenly one or two, then many, and then a vast multitude prostrated themselves before the thrones. Even departed Royalty had spiritual influence enough to make sacred the places where they had been. That is not our Western way. But nevertheless the Empire as a whole has the same loyalty at its heart. No other name but that of kingship could bind together in one indissoluble whole so many races and peoples, languages and tongues. As one dominating Empire destined to give to the earth a measure of peace and hope such as the Roman Empire desired to give, the British Empire can hold together under the central attraction of a common King. Withdraw that central dominant but silent force and Britain will fail as Rome failed after centuries of greatness.

THE STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM

1. **The History of the Thirty Years' Peace.** By HARRIET MARTINEAU. Bell. 1877.
2. **Manual of Military Law.** War Office. 1907.
3. **The Referendum among the English.** By S. R. HONEY. Macmillan. 1912.

ENGLAND has been passing through a crisis such as happily is rare in the history of our country. Between the middle of one week and the beginning of the next we were brought to the very edge of the abyss of civil war. If we look back and ask why such a disaster should have been risked—and indeed should still be threatened—the only reply that can be found is almost as grave, from the point of view of the nation, as the crisis itself. In substance, the men who control the government of our country have for two years past been engaged in a conspiracy which involves on their part a complete disregard of the basic principles of English liberty. They have been trying to impose by force on a portion of the kingdom a form of government to which its inhabitants are passionately opposed, and they have claimed the right to commit this act of tyranny, and at the same time to alter the constitution of the whole kingdom, without first obtaining explicit leave from the electors themselves. That this action is the result of a conspiracy is not disputed even by the most faithful supporters of the Government. When Mr. Bonar Law made a definite appeal in the House of Commons to the Prime Minister to submit the Home Rule Bill to the test of a referendum, the 'Westminster 'Gazette,' in its issue of March 20, replied that, though the proposal had many attractions, it could not be accepted because 'the Liberal Party has clear obligations to the Irish. It has 'conducted this controversy with them on certain conditions, 'honourably accepted by both, and it could not without their 'consent alter these conditions in a vital respect.' Even more conclusive than this explicit statement is Sir Edward Grey's implicit confession. Mr. Balfour, speaking in the House of Commons on the 2nd of April last, suggested that there was a

written agreement between the Government and the Nationalists. Sir Edward Grey promptly interposed to say that he had already denied this. The denial, he said, was given 'in answer 'to a question put from the other side whether there was any 'written obligation. I said there was none whatever.' Mr. Balfour accepted the correction and pressed home the inference: 'I unreservedly withdraw the word "written" and substitute 'the word "definite"—a definite understanding that the 'Bill should be on the Statute Book before a general election.' Sir Edward Grey sat silent. The conclusion is irresistible. The Liberal Party is bound by a bargain with Mr. Redmond to force the Home Rule Bill through Parliament without consulting the people of the country. That is a conspiracy, directed equally against the people of Ulster and the electors of the whole kingdom.

When brought face to face with these crude facts, the defenders of the Government are in the habit of riding off upon the statement that the Liberal Party has been consistently in favour of Home Rule, and that the understanding with Mr. Redmond is not a corrupt bargain but an honourable alliance between two parties for the attainment of a policy on which both are agreed. Even if this statement were historically true, it would not over-ride the moral obligation resting upon the Government of the day, first to refrain from taking steps which will drive loyal subjects into rebellion, and secondly to consult the country before a far-reaching change is made in the constitution. But the statement is not historically true. That some Liberals have been consistently in favour of Home Rule is of course true. It is also true that the Liberal Party, as a party, supported Home Rule from 1886, when Mr. Gladstone brought forward the first Home Rule Bill—much to the surprise of most of his followers—till 1893, when the second Home Rule Bill was rejected by the House of Lords. Instead of then going to the country to challenge the decision of the Lords, the Liberal Party meekly accepted their defeat, dropped the subject of Home Rule, and proceeded to discuss a Parish Councils Bill. Mr. Gladstone, disheartened by the backsliding of his party, resigned the premiership early in 1894. From that time onwards the policy of Home Rule ceased to be an essential part of the Liberal programme. Public and positive evidence on this

point is furnished by a speech delivered on the 14th of May 1902 at a mass meeting held in the Colston Hall, Bristol, in connexion with the annual gathering of the National Liberal Federation, by Mr. Herbert Gladstone (now Lord Gladstone), then Chief Whip of the Liberal Party. The speech is reported in full in a pamphlet issued by the Liberal Publication Department. After several pages dealing with the immorality of the Tories, the need for Liberal unity, the South African War, the growth of expenditure, the Education Bill, and the Bread Tax, Mr. Herbert Gladstone, towards the end of his speech, with obvious reluctance, turned to the Irish question :

'I have got to come to the Irish question. There are many honest differences of opinion about the Irish question among Liberals. That I know as well as anyone, but I should like to caution some of my friends who, in alluding to these honest differences of opinion, do not quite realise that to ask for the confidence of the country on the ground that they have been in error for sixteen years is not likely to have a very happy result.'

He went on to quote various opinions of various Liberal leaders, and made it clear that he was himself a Home Ruler, but the emphatic note of the speech was that the Liberals ought not to quarrel over the Irish question :

'Don't let me get away from my point. I stated what the object of a Home Ruler is, but in order to carry it into effect you want a strong Liberal majority. I know as well as any man that any rupture in the party on this question, or any other, will make it impossible for the Liberals to deal in any way with Ireland or anything else. So I for one am not going to cut off my nose to spite my face . . . No man can tell in what form, in what atmosphere and under what conditions will rise again the question of Irish Government in a practical form.'

Such language as this from the chief party Whip would have been impossible if there had been anything approaching to unanimity in the party on the subject of Home Rule. The enthusiasts, or some of them, still retained their enthusiasm, but the mass of the party regarded the subject as a millstone about their necks, which should be got rid of at the first opportunity. That opportunity was not long in coming. In 1903 Mr. Chamberlain launched his campaign for tariff reform, and instantly the whole Liberal Party rallied to the defence of free trade. At the general election of 1906 Home Rule was

explicitly excluded from the Liberal programme, and the Liberal Party swept the country. From that date till January 1910, when the Liberals found themselves dependent on the Nationalists for a majority in the House of Commons, scarcely a word was whispered about Home Rule. Indeed even in 1910 the question of Home Rule was kept in the background. The ostensible ground of dispute between Mr. Redmond and the Government during the early months of that year was with regard to the campaign against the Lords. The Government, having gone to the country on the budget, wanted to get that measure re-voted by the House of Commons without delay; Mr. Redmond declined to vote for the budget until the Government had produced their scheme for abolishing the veto of the House of Lords. He was looking ahead; governments seldom do. He publicly secured his public point, and, it is now admitted that he also privately secured a definite bargain binding the Government to pass a Home Rule Bill. But even after this, the question of Home Rule was studiously kept out of sight of the electors. In the second general election of that year (December 1910) the Prime Minister avoided mentioning the subject in his election address. Mr. Birrell, with even greater cynicism, denounced as a calumny the Tory allegation that the Liberal Party intended to pass a Home Rule Bill through Parliament without a further consultation of the country.

To sum up:—Never once has a Home Rule Bill been introduced into the House of Commons except when the Liberal Party was dependent for its existence upon the Nationalist vote; the Home Rule issue has only been brought prominently before the electors on three occasions, in 1886, in 1892, and in 1895; on two of these occasions Home Rule was rejected by an overwhelming majority; on the remaining occasion the Liberals and Nationalists combined obtained a majority of 40 in a House of 670 members. From these facts it is more than legitimate, it is imperative, to deduce the conclusion that the Home Rule Bill is being now forced into law, not because the nation has demanded it, nor because the Liberal Party as a party is enthusiastic for it, but because Mr. Asquith and his colleagues are dependent for their position upon the Nationalist vote.

Even if it were true, as Liberals assert, that the principle of

the Bill was approved by the electors of the kingdom in 1910, those electors still have a right to be consulted upon the actual provisions of a Bill of such far-reaching importance; and in addition the people of North-east Ulster have a right to insist that they shall not be subjected to a new form of government without their consent.

Whatever happened at the last general election it is quite certain that the electors were not cognisant of the contents of the present Home Rule Bill, for that Bill was not drafted till a twelve-month after the election. Home Rule is a vague expression to which a dozen different meanings may be attached. One meaning was taken in 1886; another very different meaning in 1893; so that the electors in 1910 had no means of knowing what would be the meaning taken in any future Home Rule Bill. Ministers themselves did not know until they had settled the main features of the Bill with Mr. Redmond. Yet surely, if there is anything at all in the theory of democratic self-government, it is not vague phrases that should be submitted to the country, but specific proposals. So far as the Liberal Party is concerned this democratic doctrine is not an antiquated survival from a past generation when Liberalism and Liberty went hand in hand; it was explicitly asserted even so recently as February 1911 by Mr. Asquith himself. Speaking in the debate on the address on the 6th of February 1911, in reply to Mr. Balfour, who had asked for what purpose the Government had dissolved Parliament in the previous November, Mr. Asquith said:

'Why did we advise the King to dissolve parliament? The reason was a very simple one. We had submitted our proposals in principle to the electors in the preceding January, and we came back from that election with a large majority. . . . Then followed an episode which I shall never regret—the Conference. It was not until the honest and determined effort, both upon the one side and upon the other, at that Conference to arrive at an arrangement proved futile, and, by the acknowledgment of all of us, was for the time being frustrated, that we came to the conclusion that it was our duty once more to submit not only the principles but the plan to the electors of the country, and to ask from them, as we did ask, and as we have received, a renewed expression of their approval.'

Mr. Asquith here lays down, with his customary lucidity, the doctrine that when a great change in the constitution is

contemplated, and when the two political parties cannot come to an arrangement, it is the duty of the Government to submit to the electors not only the principles but the plan of the proposed change. The truer democratic doctrine would be that even if the two sets of politicians do patch up an agreement between themselves, it is still the duty of the Government to submit the proposed change in the constitution to the electors for ratification. But there is no need for the moment to press this fuller demand for the liberties of the people ; for the politicians are as far away from an agreement in 1914 on Home Rule as they were in 1910 on the House of Lords. Whether the election of December 1910 gave an effective mandate even for the principle of Home Rule has already been shown to be doubtful ; and the doubt is increased by Mr. Asquith's statement just quoted, that the whole purpose of the election was to obtain a mandate for the plan of the Parliament Bill. But, however that may be, the plan of the Home Rule Bill was not before the electors. That plan has since been the subject of embittered controversy ; attempts have been made to secure an arrangement by means of a Conference or quasi-conference, and these attempts have failed. Therefore, on the principles laid down by Mr. Asquith in February 1911 it is the duty of the Government to submit the plan to the electors for approval.

A simple method of doing this without cutting across the Parliament Act has been urged upon the Government by the Opposition—namely, to have a referendum upon the Bill. The method of the referendum is the most ancient of constitutional expedients among self-governing peoples. It is a natural device that comes into operation almost automatically to determine the policy of any group of persons acting together for common ends. The directors of a commercial company refer important questions of policy to a poll of the shareholders ; the executive committee of a trade union constantly takes a ballot of the members ; municipal authorities acting under statutes based upon ancient custom frequently refer specific questions to a poll of the ratepayers. In the New England States, which are offshoots of Old England, the referendum is a regular and long-established part of the State constitutions ; in Australia, the referendum was made part of the constitution of the Commonwealth by an Act of the Imperial Parliament, and is frequently used ; in Natal the referendum was employed,

ad hoc, to determine whether that colony should form part of the South African Union. Therefore, without looking to foreign countries, we can find in our own practice, and in the practice of self-governing communities of British origin, abounding precedents for the use of the referendum. Its success and its popularity in Switzerland—perhaps the best-governed country in the world—are facts of common knowledge.

What then is the excuse of the Government for refusing to employ this well-recognised democratic device in order to determine whether the people of the United Kingdom do approve the present Home Rule Bill, not only in principle but in plan? The excuse is that the referendum gives no conclusive answer because only 50 per cent. or less of the electorate will go to the poll. This excuse will not bear analysis. For the electors who stay away declare by so doing that they do not wish to express an opinion themselves, and by that very fact empower those who do vote to express an opinion for them. Consequently even if less than half the electors vote they still express the active will of the nation. Whether a certain minimum vote should be required before any change is made in the constitution, so as to allow for what may be called the passive will of the nation—that is, for the inertia of those who dislike change but who are too lazy or too timid to record their votes—is a theoretical point which might be worth considering in other circumstances, but it clearly does not arise in the present controversy. It is not the opponents of Home Rule who lack enthusiasm at the present time; it is the half-hearted supporters of that change who are likely to stay away from the poll.

There lies the real basis of the Liberal objection to the referendum. Liberals know that the present Home Rule Bill is nowhere popular on its merits, not even among Irish Nationalists; they know that the only way to get the appearance of a verdict in favour of the Bill is by mixing up extrinsic issues such as a campaign against the Lords, or a land campaign, or a campaign against the army. By these devices voters who are indifferent to Home Rule could be enticed to the poll; their votes would then be treated as votes in favour of the Bill; and Radical ministers would proudly proclaim that the voice of the people had approved their measure.

For the moment, however, even with the aid of all the tricks that their electioneering genius could invent for diverting the attention of the electors from the one issue on which the nation's judgment is desired, ministers decline to run the risk of an appeal to the people. They are tied by their pledge to Mr. Redmond, and unless some catastrophe intervenes they will force the Bill into law without consulting the people in any way. In so acting they are violating the spirit of our constitution; they are violating the principles which all Liberals have hitherto professed; but they can console themselves for this dishonour with the reflection that they are at least preserving intact their own position and pay.

The claim of the people of North-east Ulster that the provisions of the Bill should not be applied to them without their consent raises other and in some ways even more fundamental considerations. This claim is based upon the primary principle that free men have the right to determine their own form of government. That Liberals and Home Rulers should challenge this proposition is one of the marvellous paradoxes of the present situation. It is on this very principle that the case for Home Rule has always been grounded, and no Liberal has yet even attempted to explain why a principle which is sound for Nationalist Ireland is false for Protestant Ulster.

The principle was admirably stated by Sir William Harcourt in 1886 (House of Commons, 20th of August):

> 'The principle for which we have always contended, and shall always contend, is that you never can have social order in any country except when the people who are governed are in sympathy and in harmony with the government under which they live. That is the fundamental principle of the Liberal Party.'

The alternative to government by consent which Sir William Harcourt put forward as 'the fundamental principle of the 'Liberal Party' is government by coercion; this is what the present-day Liberals propose for Ulster. Yet for a whole generation Liberal speakers and writers have been denouncing as a folly and a crime the attempt to govern Nationalist Ireland by coercion. Take for example the following declaration made by Mr. Gladstone in the House of Commons on the 13th of February 1893:

'My contention is this—and it is the first argument I lay before the House—that a permanent system of repressive law inflicted upon or attached to a country from without and in defiance of the vast majority of its constitutional representatives, constitutes a state of things of such a character that while it exists you have not and you cannot have the first conditions of harmony and good government established in that country.'

The application of this doctrine to Ulster is clear. In North-east Ulster there is a compact Protestant population of Scotch and English origin, which both on religious and racial grounds regards with abhorrence the prospect of being governed by an Irish Catholic parliament. A Home Ruler who had any faith in his own professed principles would deal with this situation by giving to Protestant Ulster the same measure of Home Rule that he proposes to give to Nationalist Ireland. In drawing the boundary, he would be guided, as far as possible, by the sentiment of the population. Some Catholics must of necessity be included in Protestant Ulster, just as some Protestants are necessarily included in Nationalist Ireland. But the line can be drawn—if necessary with some adjustment of county boundaries—so as to make a compact State out of the five or six north-eastern counties. That State would be larger in population and more advanced in commercial and industrial development than were any of the existing over-seas dominions at the time they received self-government. It would be considerably larger than the sovereign State of Rhode Island in America, which has a smaller area and a smaller population than the single county of Antrim. Therefore there is nothing impracticable in the proposal that the Protestant country of North-east Ulster should be treated as a separate State. Whether it should be endowed with a provincial government of its own or whether it should be incorporated with England, is a matter for the people of that country themselves to determine. They have made it clear that they are quite capable of governing themselves, and they have also made it clear that they are prepared to die rather than submit to the government of a Dublin parliament. It is not for Englishmen or Scotsmen to argue whether the Ulstermen are wise or foolish. The principle of self-government requires that people should choose their own form of government by the guidance of their own faculties, not by the possibly superior wisdom of lookers-on.

Hitherto Liberals have avoided this conclusion by shutting their eyes to palpable facts. They have gone about pretending to believe that there is no essential difference between Ulster and the rest of Ireland, and that therefore the whole island should be governed as one unit. But even on this hypothesis their conduct is in flagrant conflict with their principles. For if Ireland be a unit, then surely all the people of Ireland ought to be consulted about the form of government to be given to the whole country. This has not been done. Never once in the preparation of the Home Rule Bill were the representatives of Ulster called into consultation. The Bill is the exclusive work of one section of the Irish people, and it is proposed to use force to compel the other section of the Irish people to accept it.

That is the position that the English Liberal Party has now reached. A distinguished French Liberal of the last generation once wrote: '*Être libéral c'est vouloir la liberté des autres*'—'It is the liberty of others that Liberals seek.' That magnificent definition has been completely forgotten by the Liberals of to-day. Having won power for themselves, they have forgotten the fight for freedom which they used to wage; they have become the apostles of tyranny. For a very considerable period down to 1906 they were in the position of the under-dog. Even after 1906 they found their power curbed by the veto of the House of Lords, and it was only on the passing of the Parliament Act in 1911 that they obtained full and unrestrained power. The intoxication has been too much for them. They have assumed that the accident of a parliamentary majority gives them the right to do whatever they choose, and they regard any person who opposes the execution of their will as a criminal.

Naturally this doctrine has led them into difficulties. There are some things which no tyrant can do. No tyrant can successfully order English soldiers to shoot down peaceful citizens. Yet an attempt to give an order, not greatly differing from this, was evidently made by some members of the Liberal Cabinet in March last. The attempt was repudiated by the Cabinet as a whole, but the significant fact is that the indignation of the rank and file of the party has been directed, not against the politicians who tried to carry fire and sword into Ulster, but against the soldiers who thwarted that enterprise.

The very Liberals who only a few years ago were denouncing the Boer War as a crime, who in season and out of season have pleaded for international peace almost at any price, became filled with rage when they discovered that the army of the nation could not be employed to shoot down the opponents of the Liberal party.

Of course the intellectual leaders of the party do not put the matter quite in this way. Their method of argument is to assume that the party temporarily in possession of power represents the whole nation, and that therefore any orders it gives must be obeyed. This assumption ignores the palpable fact that the actual working of our constitution is based on a perpetual warfare between two parties, each striving for the prizes of office. There have been times when this domestic warfare even affected the attitude of Englishmen towards foreign countries. In the Napoleonic wars, for example, Fox openly rejoiced over British defeats, because they were a blow to Pitt. No such scandal as this has occurred in recent times. The Liberals who opposed the Boer War did so, not for the sake of embarrassing their political opponents, but because they believed the war to be morally unjustified. When, however, the war actually began, with very few exceptions the pro-Boers laid aside their private convictions in order to support their country.

That is the present attitude of both parties in all matters of external policy. The party fight to-day is confined to domestic issues, but within those limits the combatants are as relentless and as unscrupulous as ever. With this party fight soldiers have nothing to do. Their business is to serve the nation by fighting its enemies and by helping to protect life and property when called upon in grave emergency by the civil power. Neither party is entitled to use the army for its party ends. Suppose, for example, that a reactionary Tory Government should obtain power after the next general election and should—in order to secure its position for the future—pass a measure disfranchising all persons with an income of less than £160 a year. Such a measure would justifiably be resisted by the disfranchised persons and their sympathisers. Probably, among other steps that would be taken, a march on London would be planned to overawe the House of Commons. If in such circumstances, before there had been any rioting or disorder,

the Government of the day were to call upon the army to undertake active operations against these potential rebels, the vast majority of liberty-loving Englishmen would applaud the soldiers if they refused to fire.

We need not, however, take a hypothetical case. An incident very similar to that here suggested occurred at a critical period in the modern history of England. The passing of the Reform Bill in 1832 was one of the most important revolutions ever effected without bloodshed, but it ought never to be forgotten that the absence of bloodshed was due to the refusal of British soldiers to shoot down their fellow citizens at the bidding of the Government of the day. Throughout the year 1831 the Reformers were engaged in organising 'Political 'Unions' with a view of bringing pressure to bear upon the opponents of Reform. Thousands of men belonging to all classes were enrolled. Harriet Martineau, who tells the story in her 'History of the Thirty Years' Peace,' referring to these Unions, writes:

'This was the force which kept the peace and preserved us from disastrous revolution. These people knew what they were about, and they went calmly to their work. Of course, the anti-reformers complained of compulsion, of extorted consent, of unconstitutional forces being put in action. This was true, since they themselves compelled the compulsion, and called out the unconstitutional forces. There was no question about the fact, but only about the justification for it. No one denies that occasions may and do occur when the assertion of a nation's will against either a corrupt government or a tyrannical party is virtuous, and absolutely required by patriotic duty.'

The reference to a 'tyrannical party' in the last sentence might almost have been written as a prophetic estimate of the essence of the crisis of to-day. But let us continue the story. On the 22nd of April 1831, the Bill, which had only passed its second reading in the Commons by a majority of one, was defeated in Committee of that House. Parliament was at once dissolved, and in the ensuing general election the Reformers secured an overwhelming majority. A new Bill was introduced, and after prolonged debate passed its third reading in the House of Commons towards the end of September 1831. It was rejected by the House of Lords at the beginning of October. Riots followed in several towns, notably in Bristol, but on the whole the peace was preserved.

Parliament met again in December 1831. A third Reform Bill was introduced; it was fought inch by inch, and did not pass its third reading in the Commons till the 19th of March 1832. Then came the final struggle between the Tories and the nation. Six months of popular agitation had somewhat affected the attitude of the House of Lords, and the second reading of the Bill was carried in the middle of April by a narrow majority. The danger was that the Bill would be killed in Committee. To guard against that danger the Political Unions decided to bring their forces to bear. A congregation of all the Unions of the kingdom was summoned to meet near Birmingham on the 7th of May, the day on which the Committee stage in the Lords was to begin. The meeting held on that day was estimated at 150,000 men. Further contingents arrived on succeeding days till the force gathered at Birmingham numbered 200,000 men. It was contemplated that this force should march on London, bearing a monster petition, and encamp on Hampstead Heath.

The meeting on the 7th opened with a hymn, which by a curious coincidence was called the 'Union hymn' and was 'then familiar to every child in the land.' It is sufficient to quote one verse:

> 'God is our guide! from field, from wave,
> From plough, from anvil and from loom,
> We come, our country's rights to save,
> And speak a tyrant faction's doom.
> And hark! we raise from sea to sea
> The sacred watchword, Liberty!'

At the end of the meeting one of the speakers—just as happened not long ago in Ulster—called upon every man in that vast multitude to repeat 'with head uncovered and in 'the face of heaven' the words of this solemn covenant: 'With 'unbroken faith, through every peril and privation, we here 'devote ourselves and our children to our country's cause.'

Meanwhile what were the anti-Reformers doing? They were conspiring with the aid of the Duke of Wellington to suppress the Reform movement by military force. In pursuance of this conspiracy the Bill was defeated in Committee in the Lords on the 7th of May. The following day Lord Grey resigned the premiership and the Duke of Wellington received the King's command to form a ministry. 'Orders

' were sent down to the barracks at Birmingham that the Scots ' Greys should be daily and nightly booted and saddled, with ' ball cartridge ready for use at a moment's notice.' It was currently reported that the Duke of Wellington had pledged himself ' to quiet the country in ten days.' But the Tories of 1832 had forgotten, as the Liberals of 1914 have ceased to remember, that the English soldier is first of all a citizen. Official inquiries brought back the prompt reply that the soldiers could not be relied upon to act against the people. The situation at Birmingham was most critical, for there if anywhere bloodshed would begin. On the Sunday following the great meeting of the Political Unions, the Scots Greys, after Church parade, were kept in barracks, and were set to work to sharpen their swords on the grindstone. But the regiment had taken steps to make its attitude known :

' Letters were found in streets of the town, which declared in temperate language that the Greys would do their duty if called on to suppress riot, or any kind of outrage, but that they would not act if called upon to put down a peaceful public meeting or to hinder the conveyance to London of any petition, by any number of peaceable persons. Some of these letters contained the strongest entreaties to the people of Birmingham to keep the peace, that they might not compel their sympathising friends among the Greys to act against them. Letters containing similar avowals were sent to the King, to the Duke of Wellington and to Lord Hill at the War Office.'

In face of this spirit it was clearly hopeless to try to use the army to coerce the nation. On the 15th of May the Duke abandoned the attempt to form a ministry ; Lord Grey resumed the premiership ; the King consented, if necessary, to create a batch of peers ; and the Bill passed.

In all essentials this case is identical with the circumstances of to-day. The Tory party during that critical week in May 1832 were in possession of the executive government. The Duke of Wellington, acting as *de facto* prime minister, attempted to give orders to the army to coerce the Reformers in the interests of the Tory party, and the army refused to act. There is not a Liberal living who would not—till a very few years ago—have applauded the soldiers for their conduct on this occasion. It is only the madness of party, the intoxication of unrestrained power, which induces them now to throw to the

winds the root principles of English liberty, which once were the special pride of their party.

The truth is that all the average politician cares for—the man in the ranks even more than the man in command—is the success of the party to which he belongs, not the triumph of principles which he only half understands. For this reason it is imperative that the nation should have some guarantee for its liberties more reliable than the possible forbearance of the victors in the party struggle. As the events of May 1832 and March 1914 have shown, one valuable guarantee resides in the fact that the British soldier never ceases to be a citizen, and cannot therefore be used by the Government of the day as a mechanical instrument to coerce his fellow citizens. This principle of English law is set forth in clear language in the official 'Manual of Military Law.' Chapter XII., which deals with the 'Relation of Officers and Soldiers to Civil Life,' opens with the following clause:

'The English law on this subject differs from that of some foreign countries, and a man who becomes a soldier does not cease to be a citizen. If he commits an offence against the ordinary criminal law he can be tried and punished as if he were a civilian.'

Chapter XIII. gives a 'Summary of the Law of Riot and 'Insurrection,' and states *inter alia*:

'Soldiers when acting in aid of the civil power in no respect differ in the view of the law from armed citizens.' . . .

'The law of England is that a man obeys an illegal order at his own risk, and circumstances might arise which would justify the officer in firing or not firing, notwithstanding the magistrate might give orders to the contrary.'

The naval forces are subject to the same obligations. The King's Regulations and Admiralty Instructions on this point are perfectly clear.

Equally emphatic is the statement of the law drawn up by the parliamentary committee appointed to inquire into the use of the soldiers in the Featherstone Riots, when Mr. Asquith was Home Secretary:

'A soldier for the purpose of establishing civil order is only a citizen armed in a particular manner. He cannot because he is a soldier excuse himself, if without necessity he takes human life.'

In face of these explicit statements of the law, it is extra-

ordinary to find Liberals writing and talking as if the soldier's whole duty consisted in blind obedience. More mischievous still was the attempt made by various organs of Liberal opinion to manufacture a class conflict out of the incidents occurring in the Curragh. The allegation was that the officers of the army refused to shoot persons of their own class in Ulster, but were perfectly willing to shoot down strikers. There is such a complete disregard for facts in this allegation that it is difficult to know where to begin. In the first place, the men composing the Ulster Volunteer Force are not exclusively or even mainly drawn from the middle classes ; they are mainly drawn from the wage-earning class. Probably most of them are trade unionists, and many of them are doubtless members of the Labour Party. Secondly, there is evidence that the objection to undertaking 'active operations' in Ulster, though it was expressed in the first instance by the officers because they alone were consulted, was equally felt by the men. Thirdly, there is no evidence that either officers or men in the Curragh expressed any desire to be freed from the obligation of taking action in case of disturbances imperilling life and property, and this is all that soldiers are called upon to do in connexion with labour disputes. The idea that soldiers are, or legally could be, called upon to shoot down peaceful strikers is a figment of a heated imagination.

There is, however—leaving aside these absurdities—a point that is really worth discussing, and is probably at the back of the minds of men like Mr. John Ward and Mr. J. H. Thomas, who led the House of Commons in a momentary revolt against the Cabinet for failing to insist that British soldiers should shoot Ulstermen. The underlying idea is that Ulstermen and strikers are both engaged in an organised revolt against constituted authority, and therefore military force ought to be used against both or against neither. That it would be used against both in the event of actual rioting is common ground ; but the Labour leaders contend that the army has in addition been used to prevent the success of a strike, and they point in particular to the railway strike of 1911. Mr. Asquith then said : 'All the forces of the Crown, civil and 'military, will be placed at the disposal of the railway com- 'panies to ensure that the food supplies of the people are 'not interfered with.' It is quite easy to understand how a

Labour leader, thinking only of the success of his own cause, could honestly confuse a threatened railway strike with the avowed determination of the people of Ulster to resist the establishment of Home Rule. But though both movements involve a conflict with the established Government they are fundamentally different in character.

The railway strike, if it had gone on, would have completely destroyed many of the industries of the country, and would have caused the death by starvation of thousands, perhaps tens of thousands of people. No such attack on the life of the nation is threatened by Ulster. The people of Ulster if left alone will do nothing more than peacefully organise their own government; they will interfere with no man's business, and no man's life will be imperilled. The one movement is an attempt to hold the nation to ransom for the sake of private ends—increased pay for the strikers; the other is an attempt to secure, by military organisation, constitutional safeguards which an appeal to reason and justice has failed to obtain. From all time it has been recognised, and especially by Liberals, that men are justified in fighting for their political liberties; but no one in cold blood ever ventures to advance the proposition—which is at the basis of the syndicalist strike—that a man is justified in compelling the nation to starve in order to win higher wages for himself. By all means let workmen abstain from work if they are dissatisfied with their wages; that is a fundamental liberty which distinguishes the free man from the slave. But if organised abstention from a particular kind of work results in wholesale commercial injury and risk of life, the nation must employ whatever means are available to replace the labour of the strikers and to prevent them from forcibly compelling willing workers to remain idle. A nation has a right to protect its life, even though in so doing it may thwart the plans of a Labour Union. It is the business of the Labour Unions so to frame their policy that it does not threaten the life of the community.

Ulster threatens nobody. She merely asks to be let alone. It is of course true that the people of Ulster object to the Home Rule Bill *in toto* and not merely to its application to themselves. But their opposition to the Bill as a whole is a political opposition; their military organisation is directed solely against the application of the Bill to Ulster. This

distinction, though it is constantly ignored by Liberals, has always been present. It was made abundantly clear by the authorised spokesmen of Protestant Ulster more than a year ago. In January 1913 all the nineteen Unionist members from Ireland, including Sir Edward Carson, signed a letter to the Prime Minister in which the position of Ulster was clearly set forth. The letter stated that the signatories proposed to move an amendment on the Report stage of the Home Rule Bill excluding the Province of Ulster from the operation of the Bill. They frankly admitted that the exclusion of Ulster would not conciliate their opposition to the Bill as a whole, but they added that in the case of Ulster special considerations arose because the vast body of Ulstermen will 'regardless of all consequences refuse to submit 'to the government which it is proposed to force upon them.' They therefore urged the Prime Minister to accept the amendment 'as the only way to preserve the threatened peace of 'the realm'; and they reminded him that the Liberal party 'has not been wont in the past to be deaf to the claims of 'a free population to remain under the government they 'love and to be saved from a government they hate.'

There can indeed be no manner of doubt that the military opposition of Ulster to the Bill would cease the moment it was announced that the predominantly Protestant area was to be excluded until such time as the inhabitants of their own free will decided to come in. To fight for more than this would be outrageous; to fight for as much as this is justifiable by every code of ethics that the world has hitherto recognised. And the practical justification for Ulster's readiness to fight is to be found in the action of the Liberal Government; for until it became quite clear that Ulster meant to fight and had the means to fight, the Government refused to listen to any appeal for the separate treatment of the province or of any portion of it. Yet Ulster's opposition to Home Rule is no new phenomenon. It has been a primary factor in the Home Rule controversy ever since that controversy began. In 1886 the father of the present First Lord of the Admiralty declared that 'Ulster will fight and Ulster will 'be right.' In 1893 the opposition of Ulster blazed up again. Even in 1907, when Mr. Birrell introduced his abortive Irish Councils Bill, there were strong protests from Ulster because

it was feared that the Bill might be a half-way house to Home Rule. Therefore any statesman, approaching the problem of Irish government with a single-minded and honest desire to solve it, would have begun by asking in what way the opposition of Ulster could be conciliated. Instead, the present Liberal Government has alternately ignored and insulted the people of Ulster, and persisted in refusing any concession to their just demands until it became quite evident that the Ulster Volunteer Force was a reality. Then at last speeches began to be made by Liberal ministers in which the necessity for doing something to meet the wishes of Ulster was admitted. What was refused to peaceful appeals for justice was conceded to the threat of armed resistance. In the world's history a good cause has seldom been of much avail unless backed by a strong arm.

But though the Cabinet talked conciliation last autumn, and inserted in the King's speech at the opening of the present session a statement recognising the serious danger of the situation which had been created in Ulster, their actual proposal for dealing with the difficulty was grotesquely inadequate. The proposal began by recognising Ulster's case to the extent of providing that any county of Ulster might vote itself out of the Bill by means of a referendum. That was a reasonable proposal, though marred by foolish details, such as the absurdity of treating the county of Derry and the city of Derry as separate units. But there followed a proviso limiting the proposed exclusion to six years. It is almost inconceivable that sane men could imagine that the passionate resistance of Ulster to Home Rule could be bought off by a six years' respite. Even if the passions involved had been less fierce, the proviso would still have been logically indefensible. For if it is right that the Ulster people should to-day determine their acceptance or rejection of the Home Rule Bill by a popular vote, it is equally right that they should do so six years hence. The plea that within the period of six years there will be two general elections in the United Kingdom, at either of which the present scheme of Home Rule may be revised, shows an extraordinary ignorance of the attitude of Ulster. The refusal of Ulstermen to submit to a Home Rule parliament does not depend on the fact that the present Bill has never received the approval of the electors

of the kingdom; that is a constitutional question for British electors to consider. The claim of Ulstermen is that they themselves have a right to determine their own national destiny, and even if the Home Rule Bill were endorsed by an overwhelming majority of the electors of Great Britain and Ireland, the Protestants of Ulster would still hold—and rightly hold—that they would be morally justified in resisting by force of arms any attempt to transfer them against their will to a government which they hate.

For this reason even a referendum, though it would meet the constitutional objection to the Home Rule Bill, would not meet the Ulster objection. Still less can that objection be met by the vague chance that at one or other of two prospective general elections the attention of British electors might be directed to the affairs of Ulster, and that as a result the Home Rule Act might be amended so as to permit the Protestant counties still to remain outside the authority of a Dublin parliament. This at any rate is certain, that the attention of British electors, like the attention of British Cabinet ministers, will only be directed to Ulster if Ulster makes it clear that she means to fight for her liberties. So that if the scheme of exclusion for six years were inserted in the Bill the principal effect would be to require—and to justify—the continued maintenance of the Ulster Volunteer Force. And during all that period of suspense there would be the ever-present danger that pent-up passions might suddenly blaze forth and civil war begin.

What, then, is to be done? The Liberals have brought in a Bill which they declared would prove a lasting settlement of the problem of Irish government. They find that to pass it in its present form would lead to civil war, while if they amend it so as to avoid that danger their Nationalist friends will not look at it. If the country were governed by common-sense principles instead of by party caucuses, the Bill would at once be dropped, and the leading men in Nationalist Ireland and in Protestant Ulster would be invited to confer together, and if possible to frame a measure for the better government of Ireland which could be accepted by all Irish parties. Provided such a measure were fair to the British taxpayer—which the present Bill is not—it would probably be accepted without further question by the people of Great Britain. But this

common-sense course will not be followed because the one thing a party politician will never do is to confess himself wrong. His followers will condone even the worst crime rather than pardon an honest confession of error.

Failing voluntary action on the part of the Cabinet it is the duty of the Unionist Party to press unceasingly for a referendum on the Home Rule Bill. The alternative demand for a general election does not serve the purpose. Not merely does it—as already urged—confuse the issues, but it leaves the Unionist leaders under the unpleasant suspicion of exploiting Ulster for the benefit of the Unionist Party. However sincere the spokesmen of the party may personally be in their declarations of disinterestedness, nothing will get rid of the fact that in a general election fought upon the Irish issue great pecuniary and honorific advantages will accrue to the Unionist Party if the cause of Ulster prevails. Such a fact makes the average elector suspicious—more suspicious than most politicians imagine. In the case of a referendum that suspicion does not arise. It is true that the Government—ignoring the practice of other democratic countries—would probably construe the defeat of the Bill as such a blow to their pride that they would no longer hold office. But in that case they would advise the King to dissolve Parliament, and it would be in the ensuing general election, not in the referendum poll, that the country would decide between the rival claims of Liberals and Unionists for ministerial office. A referendum on the Home Rule Bill decides nothing beyond the fate of that Bill. If the Unionist leaders would take a little more pains to make this clear to the country they could win for the cause of the Union a great moral force that the ordinary intrigues of politicians will never arouse.

A question of some importance remains. At the time of writing there seems little chance that the Government will yield another inch before the Bill leaves the House of Commons. The attitude of the House of Lords is still in doubt. The prevailing sentiment among the peers is said to be that the Bill should be again rejected on its second reading. That is mildly dramatic, but it is not common sense. The rejection on the second reading will have no other effect than to deprive the peers of the opportunity of moving amendments in committee. That is an opportunity not to be thrown away. It is true that

the Government can summarily reject the amendments, but if they are well framed the country will consider them, and it is to the public opinion of the nation that the final appeal must be made. To introduce a multitude of amendments in the hope of converting what is a thoroughly bad Bill into a workable measure would be waste of time and would merely serve to confuse the public mind. Only two amendments of substance are required. The first would provide that the north-eastern counties of Ulster should be excluded from the Bill until of their own free will they decided to come in; the second would provide that the Bill should not become law until it had received the approval of the majority of the electors on a referendum. These are the two crucial points. They have been pressed in general terms by the Unionists in the House of Commons, but it would be a great advantage to have them set down in black and white by amendments moved in the Lords. By passing the second reading so as to insert these amendments, the House of Lords in no way commits itself to the principle of the Bill; it merely recognises the fact that its power to reject the Bill has gone.

What effect this or any other course of procedure will have upon the Government cannot be predicted. In no direction is the outlook hopeful. The country is in fact engaged in a struggle for the very elements of constitutional freedom. According to the general tendency of our past experience we should expect to find the cause of freedom opposed by the Tory party and supported by the Liberals. The contrary is the case. The Liberals, for all their fine phrases about trusting the people, about the crime of coercion and the futility of force, are in effect acting the part of tyrants. The Unionists, whatever their past history may have been, whatever their future conduct may be, are at the present moment fighting for the sacred cause of English liberty. It is over their heads to-day that the banner of freedom waves.

EDITOR.

No. CCCCXLIX. will be published in July.

INDEX

Titles of Articles are printed in heavy type.

Acton, Lord, *cited*, 99, 281
Adam, Paul, 58, 72–4; *Stéphanie*, 63, 72, 74
Adams, John Quincy, 221
Adderley, Sir Charles (Lord Norton), 438, 439
Aga Khan, **The Indian Moslem Outlook**, 1
Agriculture, British, The Position and Prospects of, 284; the agricultural depression of a generation ago, 284–5; some features of the last decade of prosperity, 285 *et seq.*; area under cultivation, 286–8; live stock figures, 288; intensive cultivation, 286, 288–9; indications of distrust in the stability of the situation, 289; effects of political exploitation, 289–90; examination of proposed remedies, 290 *et seq.*; Small Holdings, 290 *et seq.*; the demand for small holdings, 290–1, 296; outlook of the agricultural abourer, 291–2; relative advantages of large and small farms, 292 *et seq.*; economic inferiority of the small farm, 292–3, 297; co-operation, 294; the historical argument, 295; effect of the movement of prices, 296; industrial competition with agriculture, 296–7; security of tenure, 297 *et seq.*; security of tenure in specialised forms of agriculture, 298–9; Land Courts, 297, 299; increased rents and improvement in farming, 300; improvement by education, 301 *et seq.*; agricultural colleges, 302; progress and possibilities in rural education, 303; provision for the small farmer, 304; the gap between the primary school and the Institute, 304–5; the need for continuation schools, 305–6; conclusion, 306. *See also under* **Land Tyranny.**
Allan, Miss Maud, 124, 132, 133, 140
Allot's *England's Parnassus*, 142, 154–5
Arnold, Matthew, *cited*, 344
Arnold, T. W., *The Preaching of Islam*, 1, 5
Australia, rural populations in, 244

Bakst, M. Léon, 135
Balzac, *cited*, 41, 64, 78
Barbier, Auguste. *See* **French Satirist in England, A.**
Barrès, Maurice, 58, 63, 66–8, 70; *quoted* on Henri Beyle, 48, 49
Bedford, Duke of, 250
Bedlam in 1836...334
Bee. *See* **Honey-Bee, The.**
Beethoven, *cited*, 373
Bergson, M., 65–6; *L'Evolution Créatrice*, 66
Beyle, Henri, 35; characteristics of his mind, 36–7; literary reputation of, in France, 36–7; circumstances of his life, 37 *et seq.*; at Moscow in 1812...38–9; literary activity, 39; death, 39; epitaph, 39; his novels, 40; attitude to the Romantic movement, 40; attitude towards his art, 41, 42; contrast with Balzac, 41–2; Zola's criticism of, 42; capacity for summarising, 43; description of the Battle of Waterloo, 43–4; his psychological studies, 44; essentially a man of feeling, 45; devotion to the fine arts, 45; his 'espagnolisme,' 45–6; the contradictions of his double nature, 46 *et seq.*; his desire for dryness, 47; miscellaneous writings, 49; *le Beylisme*, 49; a born rebel, 50; character in private life, 51–2
Biblical criticism, 259-60
Bickersteth, G. L., *Carducci*, 368-9, 379
Bingham, Professor Hiram, *quoted*, 230

Bordeaux, Henry, 63, 69–71, 72
Bourget, Paul, 58, 64–5, 70, 71; *Le Disciple*, 60, 64–5; *Pages de critique et de doctrine*, 65, 71
Bradley, Henry, 312, 320, 321, 326
Brazilian Chamber and the Monroe Doctrine, 231
British Agriculture, The Position and Prospects of. *See* Agriculture.
Browning, E. B., Cry of the Children, 338
Bruce, Sir Charles, **The Crown Colonies and Protectorates**, 427
Bruges, 58–9
Brunetière, 63–4
Bruno, Giordano, 89–90
Burke, Edmund, 100, 101, 103, 106

Caldéron, F. Garcia, *Latin America*, 217 *note*
Campbell, Colin, 247
Canadian Naval Aid Bill, 463 *et seq.*
Canning, 218, 219, 228
Capella y Pons, F., *Monroïsme*, 212, 216, 222
Carducci, Giosue, The Prose and Poetry of, 368; the activities of Carducci, 369; summary of his work as a man of letters, 370; characteristics, 370–1, 374; his view of literary criticism, 371; purity of his style, 371–2; comparison with D'Annunzio, 372–3, 377; historical inspiration of his work, 373, 381; the five discourses *Dello Svolgimento della Letteratura Nazionale*, 370, 374; attitude to Christianity, 375; polemical prose, 377; influence of Heine, 378, 384, 385; poetical work, 379 *et seq.*; political animus in his work, 380, 382; sonnets, 383; emotion in Carducci's poems, 385; limits of his genius, 386–7
Casteel, D. B., on the Honey-Bee, 157, 159, 166
Castlereagh, Lord, 235
Cathay and the Way Thither, 409, 423–6
Catholicism in France, 74 *et seq.*
Caxton, 103
Cervantes, 142, 146–8
Chamberlain, Houston Stewart, 79; *Das Drama Richard Wagners*, 79; *Richard Wagner*, 79–80; *Die Grundlagen des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, 80 *et seq.*, 87; on the influence of the ancient civilisations, 80–1; attacks upon the Jews, 81–2; on the influence of the Teuton, 82–3; *Immanuel Kant*, 83 *et seq.*; contrast of Kant with Goethe, 87; controversion of Schopenhauer, 88; Leonardo da Vinci, 88; Descartes, 88; Giordano Bruno, 89; Plato, 90; *Goethe*, 90
Charlemont, James, First Earl of, *Correspondence and Manuscripts of, quoted*, 347 *et seq. passim*
Chatterton-Hill, Georges, The Evolution of Contemporary French Literature, 53
Chesterfield, the Earl of, 347–8
Chesterton, G. K., *Orthodoxy*, 412
Chuquet, Arthur, *Stendhal-Beyle*, 35, 36, 38, 41, 52
Claudel, Paul, 53, 75, 77
Coal Mines (Minimum Wage) Act, 195
Coleridge, Herbert, 308
Collings, Jesse, 285; *The Colonisation of Rural Britain*, 284
Colquhoun, Mrs. A., *The Vocation of Woman*, 14, 19, 26 *et seq.*
Cox, Harold, **The Coming Land Tyranny**, 237; **The Struggle for Freedom**, 481
Craigie, William A., 313, 326
Crawford, C., *England's Parnassus*, 142, 154–5
Croce, Professor Benedetto, *La Critica*, 368, 370, 371, 379, 381
Crooks', Mr. W., Strikes Bill, 210
Crown Colonies and Protectorates, The, 427; Mr. Harcourt's review, 428 *et seq.*; classification of the trade of the empire, 429; economic resources of the Crown Colonies 429 *et seq.*; vegetable oils, 432; nut-crushing for oil, 433; science and the utilisation of waste, 433; by-products in food, drink, and tobacco, 433–4; essential oils, 435; medical drugs, 435; mineral oils, 436; gold and precious stones, 436–7; baser minerals, 437; ocean resources, 437; water power, 438; colonial policy in the nineteenth century, 438–9; the work of the Kew Gardens, 440 *et seq.*; West Indian Department of Botany, 441, 442–3, 445; Ceylon Agricultural Society, 442–3; the proposal for a College of Tropical Agriculture, 442–3; work of the Imperial Institute, 443; Imperial communication, 445–6; railway construction, 445–6; post and telegraph, 446; the terms of the

trust under which the Crown Colonies are held, 447
Cui, César, *La Musique en Russie*, 107, 113 *et seq.*
Current Literature, 142–56, 409–26

Dalcroze, M. Jacques, 133
Dancing, The Renaissance of, 123; public attitude to dancing, 123; the ballet, 123–4; the present revival: dancing as an art, 124, 128, 131; evolution of dancing, 125; the abnormal exultation produced by dancing, 126–7; dancing in early times: Egypt, India, Greece, Rome, 127; dancing and manners, 128; the theatrical ballet in England, 129–31; Taglioni, 130; the revival of classical dancing, 131–3; Miss Isidora Duncan, 131–2; the art of Miss Maud Allan, 132, 133; M. Jacques Dalcroze's 'Eurythmics,' 133; Mme. Pavlova, 134; the Russian Ballet, 129, 134 *et seq.*; M. Nijinski, 135–9; comparison with post-impressionism in art, 139; the Tango, 140–1
D'Annunzio, Gabriele, *cited*, 369, 372, 377
Dante, Alighieri, 83 *and note*; *De Monarchia*, 92, 95, 469–71, 472
Daru, 38
da Vinci, Leonardo, 88
Debussy's opera, 111
De la Mare, Walter, **Current Literature**, 142–56, 409–26
Delaville, M., *Essai sur l'Histoire de l'Idée de Progrès*, 91
De Lanessan, J. L., 448, 457
Dent, E. J., *Mozart's Operas*, 107, 114 *note*
Descartes, 89
De Sélincourt, Basil, *Walt Whitman*, 409, 419–22
de Staël, Mme, *De l'Allemagne*, 68
de Vogüé, Melchior, 60
Diaghilev, M. Serge de, 129, 134
Dickens, Charles, *cited*, 333, 342, 418
Disraeli, 411
Dryden, 413–4
Duncan, Miss Isidora, 124, 131, 132, 140
Durham, The Dean of, **The Issue Kikuyu**, 257

East India Progress and Condition Report, 1, 11
Ecclesia Anglicana. *See under* Zanzibar, Bishop of.
Ellis, Havelock, *Man and Woman*, 14, 31, 32
England in 1836, a French view, 332 *et seq.*
England's Parnassus, 142, 154–5
Entente Cordiale, the, 457
Erasmus, *cited*, 99
Estaunié, Edouard, 67, 70
Eve, Trustram, 248–9
Eversley, Lord, on the Unionist land scheme, 249 *et seq.*
Evolution of Contemporary French Literature, The, 53

Fawkes, Rev. A., *Studies in Modernism*, 142–5, 409
Fitzmaurice-Kelly, J., *Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra*, 142, 146–8
Flaubert, 71, 72
Flitch, J. E. Crawford, *Modern Dancing and Dancers*, 123, 124, 128, 129, 131, 141
Flood, Henry, 360–1, 363, 364
Ford, Worthington C., *Some Original Documents on the Genesis of the Monroe Doctrine*, 212, 220, 221
Foundations, cited, 278–9, 281
Fox, Wilson, *Report on Wages and Earnings of Agricultural Labourers*, 252
France, the Three Days' Revolution, 328–9
France, Anatole, 55, 56–7, 58
Frazer, J. G., *The Golden Bough*, 389 *et seq.*; *The Belief in Immortality*, 399
French Literature, Contemporary, The Evolution of, 53; a renascence of French energy, 53–4; effect in the national literature, 55, 62, 63; characteristics of the literature of the nineteenth century, 55–7; the tendency to pessimism, 55–7, 62; Anatole France and Pierre Loti, 56, 57, 61–2; leading representatives of surviving French pessimism, 56, 58; Rodenbach, 58–9; Maeterlinck, 59; characteristics of the young French generation of to-day, 59, 73–4; Edouard Rod, 60–2; Melchior de Vogüé, 60; Mirbeau's *Dingo*, 62; Brunetière, 63–4; Bourget's *Disciple*, 60, 64–5; reaction against intellectualism, 64; Bergson, 65–6; Maurice Barrès, 66–8; the recovery of patriotism, 66–8; the legend of the German intellectual superi-

ority, 66, 68; Henry Bordeaux, 69–71, 72; the legend of French degeneracy due to the influence of French literature, 71; the naturalistic school, 71–2; Paul Adam, 72–4; Catholicism of the younger generation, 74; the *action française*, 74; Charles Péguy, 75–7; Catholic poetry, 75–6; Pierre Lasserre, 77; other characteristic works, 77–8
French Satirist in England, A., 327: poets of temporary genius, 327; the poetry of Auguste Barbier, 327; The Three Days' Revolution, 328–9; 'La Curée,' 329–30; Barbier's Satires, the 'Iambes,' 331; 'Il Pianto,' 331; satires on Barbier, 331–2; poems in dispraise of England: 'Lazare,' 332 *et seq.*; description of London, 333; 'Bedlam,' 334; 'Le Gin,' 335; 'Le Minotaure,' 336; 'Les Belles Collines d'Irlande,' 337; on English poetry, 337–8; on the English poor, 338; on child labour, 338; 'La Tamise,' 338–9; 'Le Fouet': on treatment in the army, 339–40; 'Les Mineurs de Newcastle,' 340; Barbier's anger against England with regard to India, 341; 'Westminster,' 341; 'Les Hustings': electoral practices in 1836...342; 'Le Pilote' international politics, 342–3; Shakespeare, 343–4; the English 'spleen,' 344–5; railways; the steamer; machinery, 345; 'La Nature,' 345; Epilogue, 345; the exactitude of Barbier's observations, 343; explanation of the neglect of 'Lazare,' 332, 345–6
Froude, J. A., *History of England*, 91, 105
Furnivall, Frederick J., 308–9, 310

Gairdner, Dr. J., *cited*, 106
Genée, Mlle. Adeline, 131
George, Henry, the single-taxer, 238
George, Lloyd, 237 *et seq.*, 466
Germany, the new orthography in, 318, 320
Germinet, Vice-Admiral, 457
Gide, M. André, *cited*, 35, 43
Goethe, 51, 87–8, 90
Gosse, Edmund, A French Satirist in England, 327; *Critical Kit-Kats*, 419
Grattan, 358, 359–61
Grimm's *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, 307

Haggard, Sir Rider, *Rural Denmark and its Lessons*, 237; *Rural England*, 237, 245
Hall, A. D., *A Pilgrimage of British Farming*, 237, 245, 284
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. L., *Speeches*, 427 *et seq. passim*
Hardinge, Lord, 7, 11
Hastings, Dr. *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, 270, 271
Haversham Committee, 247–8
Healy, Mr. Tim., 360, 362
Heat engines. *See* Power, The Production of.
Heine, 374, 378, 384, 385
Henson, H. Hensley, The Issue of Kikuyu, 257
Hinkson, Katharine Tynan, *Twenty-five Years' Reminiscences*, 142, 150–2
Hodgson, R., *A Song of Honour*, 409, 422
Home Rule, an eighteenth-century Parallel, 354 *et seq.* *See* Struggle for Freedom, The
Honey-Bee, The, 157; social life of the honey-bee, 157, 168, 172; the three ranks of bees, 157; activities of the varying ranks, 158, 164; formation of the new combs, 158–60: production of wax, 158, 164; the cells, 159–61, 168; the larva sac, 160–1; repair and cleaning of the comb, 161; the *propolis*, 161; average number of bees in hive, 161; the queen, 161, 168 *et seq.*; the drone, 161–2, 168; the egg-laying, 162, 168; drone-eggs, 162–3; queen eggs, 163; larva, 163, 164; the 'royal-jelly,' 163, 164; the young bee, 164–5; the ventilation of the hive, 165; attraction of bees to colour and scent in the flowers, 165; collection of pollen, 165, 166; and of nectar, 166, 167; speed of the flying bee, 166, 167; conversion of nectar into honey, 167; working life of the bee, 168, 172; swarming, 158, 168, 169, 170; the young queen, 170, 171, rival queens, 170, 171; mating of the queen, 171; destruction of drones, 171–2
Hoops, Professor J., The Oxford Dictionary, 307
Huerta, General, 212, 213, 215
Humperdinck's *Königskinder*, 108, 120
Huysmans, J. K., 75, 77, 78

Index Librorum Prohibitorum in England, The, 103
Indian Moslem Outlook, The, 1: Moslem interest in the fate of Turkey, 1–4; no Pan-Islamic agitation, 2; effects of the spread of Western enlightenment, 3, 4, 9; Hindus and Moslems contrasted, 4, 10; essential unity of Moslems, 4, 5, 8; the King's Moslem subjects and British foreign policy, 5–6, 7, 8; the break up of Turkey disadvantageous to Great Britain, 6–7; Moslem views regarding British action in Persia, 7–8; the growth of Indian nationhood, 9–10; the All India Moslem League, 110; educational progress and economic development, 11–12; Indian students and the Universities, 12; treatment of Indians in South Africa, 1, 12–13; East Africa, Zanzibar, and Pemba, 13; feeling as to free criticism in local affairs, 13
Industrial Disputes, The Compulsory Settlement of, 195: freedom to strike, 195; *ad hoc* action by the State, 195–6; restrictions on freedom to strike, 196 *et seq.*; laws to secure continuity of service, 196; laws regulating industrial relations, 196; restrictions in certain industries, 197; policy of Germany, Austria, and Belgium, 197; effective regulation only in State-controlled industries, 198; laws of European States directly prohibiting strikes and lock-outs, 198; a law against strikes based on differences of motive or intention, 199; prohibition laws of English Colonies, 199 *et seq.*; Canada and Transvaal, 199–200, 202; the Australasian Colonies, 200 *et seq.*; restriction on strikes and State regulation of industrial relations, 202–3; enforcement of law against recalcitrants, 203 *et seq.* various penalties, etc., 204; fine and imprisonments: experience in the Australasian States, 205; law based upon organised labour, 205–6; involves encouragement of labour organisation, 206; and State control of unionism, 206; effectiveness of labour laws, dependent upon working class opinion, 207, *et seq.*; analysis of the causes of hospitality to prohibitory laws, 207 *et seq.*; difficulties in the way of providing an alternative to a strike, 208; growth of trade unionism and faith in the power of political action, 209–10; present feeling against restriction on freedom to strike, 210
Ireland in 1836, a French view of, 337
Irish Viceroys before the Union, 347: the Earl of Chesterfield, 347 *et seq.*; the Irish 'undertakers,' 349; Townshend's administration, 349 *et seq.*; the passing of the Limitation Bill, 350–1; the Octennial Bill, 351–2; Townshend's recall, 352; Earl Harcourt, 352–3; Absentee Tax, 353; defection of Henry Flood, 353; Lord Buckinghamshire, 353–7; the Volunteer movement, 354–7, 358, 361, 363, 364; the Earl of Carlisle, 357–9, 360; William Eden, 358–9; Grattan's Declaration of Right, 354, 358–60; the Duke of Portland, 359, 362; Flood dismissed from office, 361; Flood and Grattan, 360–2, 363–4, 367; Earl Temple, 362–3, 365–6; the agitation for absolute renunciation, 361–2; Lord Mansfield's writ of error, 362; the Earl of Northington, 363–4; the Duke of Rutland, 364–5; the Commercial Propositions, 365; the Regency agitation, 365; Earl Fitzwilliam, 366–7; Catholic emancipation, 366–7
Italian literature, 368, 377

James, Henry, *Notes of a Son and Brother*, 409, 414–19
Jammes, Francis, 75, 77
Jeanroy, A., *Giosue Carducci. L'Homme et le Poète*, 368, 369, 379
Johnson, A. E. *The Russian Ballet*, 123, 129, 130, 134, 136

Kant, Immanuel 69, 83 *et seq.*; not an irreligious man, 84; contrast with Goethe, 87–8, 88 *n.*
Kew, Royal Botanic Gardens, 440 *et seq.*
Kikuyu, The Issue of, 257: evangelistic enterprise and sacerdotalism, 258; secularism and the Christians' desire for external union, 258–9; secularism and the native populations, 259; the revolt against traditional Christian theo-

logy, 259–60; the Kikuyu Conference, 260 *et seq.*; the Bishop of Zanzibar's 'Open Letter,' 262 *et seq.*; the Church of England is a Protestant Church, 265; Bishop Stubbs, *quoted*, 265–6; the Bishop of Zanzibar's 'Open Letter' the expression of a widely represented conception of Anglicanism 266–7, 269; the Primate's decision, 267–8; the two questions to be referred to the Central Consultative Committee, 268; the Bishop of Zanzibar's protest, 268–9; the description of non-Episcopal Churches, 268, 270, 277; on the necessity of Episcopal Ordination, 269 *et seq.*; Dr. Darwell Stone's Statement of the 'Anglican Doctrine of the Church,' 270 *et seq.*; a new school of Anglicans: the Romanising party, 274–5; effect of the new Anglicanism, 275; the situation in Canada, 276; the Lambeth Conference, 277; Modernism: *Foundations*, 278 *et seq.*; Christian unity, 282–3

Kingship, The Significance of, 469; the ruling power must be a unity, 469–70; Dante's *De Monarchia*, 469–71, 472; the ideal monarchy, 470; development of English Common Law and political constitution, 471; reaction of English political life on foreign forms of government, 472; hereditary kingship, 472–3, 475; the presidential system, 473–5; the hereditary legislative chamber, 475–6; government by majorities, 475–6; the continuity of kingship, 476–7; the Act of Settlement, 476–7; the King and constitutional law, 477–8; the King and his ministers, 478; kingship and national friendship, 478–9; loyalty to the principle of kingship, 479–80

Kitchener, Lord, *quoted*, 449

Knox, R., *Some Loose Stones*, 274

Kraus, Dr. H., *Die Monroe Doktrin*, 212, 217 *et seq.*

Land Tyranny, The Coming, 237; the failure of the land taxes, 237, 254; the new land campaign, 237–8; Mr. Lloyd George and the single taxers, 238; the powers to be entrusted to the new Land Commissioners, 239; minimum wage of agricultural labourers, 239, 252; readjustment of rents, 240; the Scottish Land Court at work, 241; power to fix the price of land, 241; urban land, 241; the letting of business premises, 242 *et seq.*; the State and private contracts, 243; decline of rural populations, 244, 246; as to the inadequate development of the resources of the soil, 245; the improvement in English agriculture, 245–6; security of farmers' capital, 246 *et seq.*; the Haversham Committee, 247–8; proposed amendments of the Agricultural Holdings Act, 247; the Unionist land scheme, 249; Irish Land Purchase Act not analogous, 249; futility of State-aided purchase, 249; the Duke of Bedford's sales, 250; the fixing of judicial rents, 250–1; labourers' wages, 252; the State and speculative building, 253 *et seq.*; attitude of the Unionist party, 256; electioneering the real purpose of the new programme, 256. *See also under* **Agriculture, British.**

Lang, Andrew, 390

Lansdowne, Lord, 249

Larkin, Mr., 243

Lasserre, Pierre, 63 *note*, 77

Latter, O. H., *Bees and Wasps*, 157, 158, 170

Le Goffic, Charles, 77–8

Leonard, R. M., *The Pageant of English Poetry*, 155

Literature, Current, 142–56, 409–26

Littré's *Dictionnaire*, 307

London in 1836, a French view of, 332 *et seq.*

Loti, Pierre, 55, 56, 58, 59, 61–2

MacDonald, Ramsay, *cited*, 204

McKechnie, W. S., *Magna Carta*, 469, 473

Maeterlinck, Maurice, 55, 58, 59; *La Vie des Abeilles*, 159, 172

Magic or Religion? 389; Frazer's *The Golden Bough*, 389, 390 *et seq.*; Tylor's *Primitive Culture*, 390; Andrew Lang and anthropology, 390; Robertson Smith, 391, 395, 404; *The Golden Bough*, new edition, 391; Spencer and Gillen's *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, 393, 403; Christian origins in *The Golden Bough*, 394;

the third edition, 394 *et seq.*; Dr. Frazer's theories, 395, 396 *et seq.*; the sub-title *A Study in Magic and Religion*, 397; definitions of Magic and Religion, 398 *et seq.*; M. Durkheim's theory, 403; the origin and meaning of sacrifice, 404–5; the regicidal philosophy, 405–6; appreciation of Dr. Frazer's work, 406–8
Manchester, Bishop of, *quoted*, 274
Mann, Tom, 210
Marett, Dr. R. R., **Magic or Religion?** 389
Mercure de France, 57
Mexico, affairs in, 212
Meynell, Everard, *The Life of Francis Thompson*, 142, 148–50
Mill, John Stuart, 209
Mirbeau, Octave, *Dingo*, 62
Modernism, 278 *et seq.*, 409–10
Monroe, President, 220
Monroism, The New, 212; the British recognition of General Huerta, 212, 213; the authoritative statement of the United States point of view, 214, 225, 227, 234; President Wilson's Mexican policy, 214–15, 225; Mr. Asquith's Guildhall speech and the United States Mexican policy, 212 *et seq.*, 229, 234; probable effect on sentiment of Latin-American nations, 216; antagonism to the United States in Latin America due to recent developments of the Monroe doctrine, 216, 229; history of the Monroe doctrine, 217; Great Britain and the principle of intervention, 218, 228, 235; the two underlying principles of the Monroe doctrine, 219; the principle of non-colonisation, 219; the Americas and the Great Alliance, 220; the foundations of the Monroe doctrine, 221; the reciprocal obligation of non-intervention in the affairs of Europe, 221; developments of American Imperialism, 222; developments of the Monroe doctrine, 222 *et seq.*; the Americas as the exclusive sphere of influence of the United States, 222; the Lodge Resolution, 223–4; the Wilson doctrine, the new policy of intervention, 225 *et seq.*, 234; San Domingo, 226; the duty of policing the Americas, 226–7; the attitude of the Latin American peoples, 229 *et seq.*; Mr. Roosevelt's gospel of American Internationalism, 232; the balance of power and the Latin American Republics, 233; the balance of power and British interests, 234; Great Britain and American goodwill, 234; the traditional British policy, 234–6
Mordkin, M., 123, 124, 134, 140
More, Sir Thomas, *Utopia*, 95 *et seq.*, 295. *And see* **Utopian Toleration.**
Moslem Outlook. *See* **Indian Moslem Outlook.**
Moussorgsky's operas, 110 *et seq.*
Murray, Sir James A. H., 309, 310 *et seq.*, 313, 321–6 *passim*; *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, 307 *et seq.* *See* **Oxford Dictionary, The.**
Murray, R. H., **Utopian Toleration**, 91

National Service League proposals, 455–6
Navy and the Future, The, 448; the growth of the German navy, 449–51; the rise of the Russian navy, 451; Germany and the *Entente*, 452; French apprehension, 452; Great Britain and foreign maritime competition, 452–3; the Navy Estimates, 453, 454, 465; comparative naval expenditure, 454; the National Service League and the Navy, 455–7; the Mediterranean situation, 452, 457 *et seq.*; obligations implied by the Entente, 457; relation of naval situation to the Army and to compulsory service, 458; the Mediterranean and the Admiralty policy, 460–4; Mr. Churchill's speech on the Navy Estimates, 463; the Canadian ships, 464–5; estimation of naval strength, 466; the Dreadnoughts, 466–7; the submarine, 467
Newman, Cardinal, 143
New Numbers, 422–3
Nicaragua, American treaty with, 223–4 *note*
Nietzsche, *cited*, 50

Odoric of Pordenone, 423–6
Opera, A Year's, 107, 108; public attitude to opera, 107; Mr. Raymond Roze's season of opera in English, 109; operatic conductors, 109; Mr. Roze's *Joan of Arc*, 109; Sir Joseph Beecham, 110; Mr. Thomas Beecham and German

opera, 110; Russian opera: Moussorgsky and Rimsky-Korsakov, 110 *et seq.*, 116–17; Debussy, 111, 120; differences in racial taste in art, 111–12; Dvořák and Smetana, 112; Oriental feeling in Russian music, 112; Glinka, 112, 113; Russian reaction in favour of national music, 112; 'the Heap,' 112, 113, 115; Dargomijsky's use of recitative, 113, 114, 117; César Cui *La musique en Russie*, 113 *et seq.*, 122; Balakirev, 115; Borodin, 115, 116; the music and the emotional expression, 118 *et seq.*; *Pelléas et Mélisande*, 108, 118; *Giojelli della Madonna*, 108, 118; Strauss, 110, 118–9, 120–2; the problem of words and music, 120 *et seq.*
Osborne judgment, 210
Oxford, Bishop of (Dr. Gore), 270
Oxford Dictionary, The, 307; inception, 308; collecting material, 308–9, 310–11; Herbert Coleridge, 308; Frederick J. Furnivall, 308–9; James A. H. Murray, 309 *et seq. passim*; the Delegates of the Oxford Press undertake publication, 310; the Scriptorium, 311; editor's disappointments and personal privations, 311; alterations in general plan, 311–12; first instalment published, 312, 313; Henry Bradley, 312, 320, 321, 326; William A. Craigie, 313, 326; aim and scope of the work, 307, 313–14; the catchwords in, 314; unsettled orthography, 314; criteria to determine spelling, 315; spelling variations, 316; orthography and pronunciation, 316–18; the phonetic transcriptions of pronunciation, 318; English orthography and phonetic changes, 318–19; on proposals for spelling reform, 319–21, 322; reform of pronunciation needed, 321–2; cardinal features of the dictionary, 322 *et seq.*; suggested different arrangement in two features, 325; the end in sight, 326

Page, Mr., American Ambassador, speech at Savage Club, *quoted*, 231
Panama Canal, 223, 230, 231
Paris, the Three Days' Revolution, 328–9
Pavlova, Mme., 124, 134, 140
Péguy, Charles, 53, 75–7
Philological Society, 308 *et seq. passim*
Pitman, Sir Isaac, 319
Pitt, William, 342–3
Plato, 90; *Republic*, 92, 97
Poésies d'Auguste Barbier, 327 *et seq.*
Poincaré, President, 469, 475
Power, The Production of, 173; progress in power generation, 173; comparison of plants in power-distributing stations and private plants, 174; cost and conditions of supply, 174; load factor, 174–5; local conditions and the choice of plant, 175; heat engines, 175 *et seq.*; the working fluid, 176; efficiency of a heat engine, 176; increase of efficiency, 178 *et seq.*; increased boiler pressure, 178; superheating, 178; expansion, 178–9; reciprocating engines, 178–9, 182; lubrication, 179; method of increasing the fall of temperatures, 179; steam turbines, 178 *et seq.*, 193; dynamos, 181; turbine direction and speed of rotation, 181–2; the Stumpf engine, 182; gas engines, 182 *et seq.*, 189; Diesel and semi-Diesel engines, 183 *et seq.*, 186–7, 188, 193, 194; gas producers, 184; boilers, 185; steam plant and gas plant compared, 186 *et seq.*; cylinders, 187, 188, 189; development in size due to steam turbines, 188; progress in gas engines mostly foreign, 189; exhaust steam waste, 189; exhaust-steam and mixed pressure turbines, 190; water power, 191–2; wave power and tidal motion, 192–3; speculations as to the future: steam turbine, gas and Diesel engines, 193–4; fuel oils, 194; gas turbine, 194
Prothero, R. E., *English Farming, Past and Present*, 284, 295

Redesdale, Lord, **Houston Stewart Chamberlain, 79**
Renan, 57
Rimsky-Korsakov operas, 110
Roberts, Lord, 455, 458
Rod, Edouard, 55, 58, 59, 60–2
Rodenbach, Georges, 58, 59
Roosevelt, ex-President, 223, 232, 319
Rural populations, 244, 246
Rustic Speech and Folk Lore, 142, 153–4

San Domingo, 223
Schopenhauer, 88; *Essay on Woman*, 14, 15, 17, 31
Seebohm, F., *The Oxford Reformers*, 91, 105
Seligmann, Dr., 405
Shakespeare, 343–4
Shelley, Henry C., **Irish Viceroys before the Union**, 347
Shelley, P. B., *cited*, 37
Shipley, A. E., **The Honey-Bee**, 157
Simplified Spelling Society, 319, 320, 321, 322
Slang Dictionary, The, (1864), 325
Small Holdings, 290 *et seq.*
Smith, Robertson, 391, 395, 404, 405
Solvency of Woman, The, 14: the mutual criticism of the two sexes, 14–15; the attacks of women on men, 15; sex-difference and mutual comprehension, 16; Otto Weininger, 16–18; the common assumption as to woman, 18; the problem of the unmarried women, 18–19, 20, 21, 30; the ideal relation of man and woman, 19–20; the civilising zeal of women, 20; the ideal of chivalry, 20; women are insolvent: examination of Sir Almroth Wright's discovery, 21; married women and insolvency, 22; unmarried women, 22–3; the poverty of women and the Suffrage, 23; economic forces working against women, 23–6; wages of men and women, 24–5; competition and the feminist movement, 26; the higher education of women, 26–7; grounds on which the suffrage can be demanded, 27 *et seq.*; not to be given as a concession to violence, 27–8; the conflict between justice and expediency, 28; the principle of suffrage and the position of woman, 29–30; the intellectual morality and power of adjudication in women, 30, 31; the real question of expediency, 32; the interests of women not fundamentally opposed to those of men, 33; valid reasons against female suffrage, 33; present feeling as to the female suffrage, 34
Spencer and Gillen's *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, 393, 403, 405
Stadler, Hans, *Die Biologie der Biene*, 157, 162, 168, 169
Stead, W. T., *cited*, 336
Stendhal. *See* **Beyle, Henri.**
Stone, Dr. Darwell, *cited*, 270–1
Strauss' operas, 110
Strikes, State regulation of. *See* **Industrial Disputes, Compulsory Settlement of.**
Struggle for Freedom, The, 481; the Home Rule Bill: the Liberal Party's bargain with the Irish, 481–2, 484; history of Home Rule in the Liberal programme, 482–4; Home Rule and the Election of 1910, 485–6; the Government refusal of a Referendum, 486–7; the claim of Ulster 488; government by coercion, 488; the proposal for the separation of Ulster, 489–90; the Army and party politics, 490–4; the Reform Bill of 1832...492–4; relation of soldiers to civil life, 495; the Ulster opposition not analogous with a strike, 496–7; the opposition of Ulster political, 497–8; not a new phenomenon, 498; Liberal attitude to Ulster, 499; the proposal for six years' exclusion, 499–500; the way out of the dilemma, 500; duty of the Unionist party, 501; attitude of the House of Lords, 501–2
Stubbs, Bishop, *quoted*, 265–6

Taglioni, Mme., 130
Tagore, Rabindranath, *Sādhanā: The Realisation of Life*, 142, 155–6
Taylor, Roland, 106
Teetotalism, modern, 335
Tennyson, 412
Thompson, Francis, 142, 148–50
Thursfield, J. R., 448, 449
Tillett, Ben, 209
Townshend, Lord, 349 *et seq.*
Trench, Archbishop, *cited*, 308
Trevelyan, G. M., *Clio, a Muse and other Essays*, 142, 145–6
Tylor's *Primitive Culture*, 389–90
Tynan, Katharine, *Twenty-five Years' Reminiscences*, 142, 150–2
Tyndale, *cited*, 104

Uganda, Bishop of. *See* **Willis.**
Ulster revolt against Home Rule, a parallel in the eighteenth century, 354 *et seq.* *See also* **Struggle for Freedom, The**
Unionist Party, land scheme, 249 *et seq.*; and the new land campaign, 256

Utopian Toleration, 91; the idea of progress, 91; moral or political speculation before the Renaissance, 92; political theory in the Middle Ages, 92; Marsilius of Padua *Defensor Pacis*, 93; Church and State in medieval times, 93; the Renaissance, 94; geographical discoveries of the age, 94; the year 1492 ... 95; More's *Utopia*, 95–6; the moral code of Utopia, 96; Utopian institutions, 96–7; communism, 97; toleration, 97–8; the religious teaching, 98; More's attitude to toleration, 98 *et seq.*; freedom of theological thought in the fourteenth century, 99–100; parallel between More and Edmund Burke, 100–1, 103; More's medievalism, 102, 106; law and public opinion in the sixteenth century, 102–3; *The Dialogue*, 103–4; *The Confutation*, 104–5; dealings with heretics, 105, 106; More and the Papacy, 105; death of More, 106.

Verrall, A. W., *Lectures on Dryden*, 409, 414
Vespucci, Amerigo, 96
von Tirpitz, Grand Admiral, 450

Wagner, Richard, 56, 59, 79–80, 114, 120, 373
Ward, Wilfrid, *Men and Matters*, 409
Weininger, Otto, *Sex and Character*, 14, 15, 16–18, 20 *note*, 31, 32
Weston, F., Rt. Rev. Bishop of Zanzibar, *Ecclesia Anglicana. For what does she stand?* 257, 260, 262
Whitman, Walt, 419–22
Whitworth, Geoffrey, *The Art of Nijinsky*, 123, 135, 137 *et seq.*
Williams, Orlo, **The Prose and Poetry of Giosue Carducci**, 368
Willis, J. J., Rt. Rev. Bishop of Uganda, *The Kikuyu Conference*, 257, 260 *et seq.*
Wilson, President, Mexican policy of, 214 *et seq. passim.*
Winchester, Bishop of, *cited*, 270
Woods, Margaret L., *Collected Poems*, 409, 423
Wright, Sir Almroth E., *The Unexpurgated Case against Woman Suffrage*, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20 *et seq.*
Wright, E. M., *Rustic Speech and Folk Lore*, 142, 153–4
Wright, J., *English Dialect Dictionary*, 325
Wycliffe's translation of the Bible, 103

Young, Arthur, *cited*, 295, *quoted*, 300
Yule, Sir Henry, *Cathay and the Way Thither*, 409, 423–6

Zanzibar, Bishop of, *Ecclesia Anglicana. For what does she stand?* 257, 260, 262
Zola, 71–2; criticism of Beyle by, 42

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY

Do not
remove
the card
from this
Pocket.

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File."
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

Author Edinburgh Review
Title Vol 219, 1914